IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED	STATES	0F	${\bf AMERICA},$)	
		P1	aintiff)	
	vs)	19-CR-250
MARTIN	EVERS,)	
		De	fendant))	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Daubert Hearing In Re: Dr.Stephen Thomas
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT D. MARIANI
THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2021; 10:30 A.M.
SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA

FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE By: Michelle Olshefski, Esq. Assistant United States Attorney P.O. Box 309 235 N. Washington Avenue Scranton, Pennsylvania 18503

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

MYERS, BRIER & KELLY, LLP
By: Patrick A. Casey, Esq.
Frank J. Brier, Esq.
Suzanne Conaboy, Esq.
425 Spruce Street
Scranton, Pennsylvania 18503

Proceedings recorded by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

KRISTIN L. YEAGER, RMR, CRR CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER 235 N. WASHINGTON AVENUE SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA 18503

INDEX

Witness:	Direct	Cross	Redirect	Recross
Dr. Stephen Thomas	7	74	117	

EXHIBIT INDEX

For the Government:	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit No. 1	7	8
Exhibit No. 10	24	27
Exhibit No. 8	43	72
Exhibit No. 5	44	72
Exhibit No. 6	47	72
Exhibit No. 4	48	72
Exhibit No. 7	49	72
Exhibit Nos. 2&3	66	72
Exhibit No. 9	68,69,111	72

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Good morning, Your Honor.

MR. CASEY: Good morning.

MR. BRIER: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the matter of United States v. Martin Evers. In accordance with our telephone conference of Thursday, March 4, we are here to receive evidence with respect to two of the motions that have been filed on behalf of the Defendant.

The first is the Motion to Exclude the opinion and testimony of Dr. Stephen Thomas; and the second is a Motion to Suppress the search and seizure of 104 Bennett Avenue, Suite 3C, Milford PA on August 6th, 2019.

Ms. Olshefski, if you will recall, in our telephone conference of March 4, we discussed the commencement of the proceeding by your presentation of an offer of proof with respect to Dr. Thomas, specifically, indicating the basis on which you seek him to be qualified, and if qualified, the opinion that he would render.

Are you prepared to submit that now?

MS. OLSHEFSKI: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, the United States is offering the expert testimony of Dr. Stephen Thomas to testify about the events surrounding the death of Kristina Dame. Dr. Thomas has authored two expert reports in this case, wherein, he has

00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00
00:00

1

2

3

4

5

7 I

81

9

10

11

12

13

19

20

22

00:01 14 00:01 15 00:01 16 00:01 17 00:01 18

00:01 21

00:01

00:01

00:01

00:01 23

00:01 24

00:01 25

00:01 **1**00:01 **2**00:02 **3**

00:02 **4**00:02 **5**00:02 **6**

00.02

00:02

00:02

7

11

12

00:02 **8**00:02 **9**00:02 **10**

00:02 13 00:02 14 00:02 15 00:02 16

00:02 17 00:02 18

00:02

00:03 21 00:03 22 00:03 23

20

24

00:03 25

00:03

written about Kristina Dame's medical history and events
leading up to her death and will be offered to testify about
what he has included in both of those expert reports.

He's being offered to testify about whether, in his medical opinion, the prescriptions written by the Defendant, as alleged in the indictment, were written in the usual course of professional practice and for legitimate medical purposes.

He will be offered to testify about whether, in his medical opinion, the prescriptions issued to Kristina Dame by the Defendant and used by Kristina were the but-for cause of death in this case.

Dr. Stephen Thomas, who is in the courtroom and will be called to testify, in addition to his many professional accomplishments, is a Diplomate of The American Board of Anesthesiology with a subspecialty certification in Pain Medicine. He's also a Certified Independent Medical Examiner.

Dr. Thomas has been qualified as an expert in this very area, in multiple Federal and State Courts, including multiple times within the Third Circuit.

Dr. Thomas was qualified as an expert in this very area in the Middle District of Pennsylvania by the late Honorable A. Richard Caputo in the matter of United States v. Fuhai Li. The Defense there sought to exclude Dr. Thomas' testimony for similar reasons that are offered here by this Defendant.

They allege that, first, Dr. Thomas is not qualified. They

allege that Dr. Thomas' conclusions are not supported by 00:03 sufficient facts or data. They allege that his conclusions are 00:03 not the result or the use of reliable principles and methods. 3 00:03 And that Dr. Thomas did not reliably apply principles and 4 00:03 methods to this case. 5

00:03

00:03

00.03

00.03

00:03

00:03

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:04

00:05

00:05

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 l

18I

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In Li, Judge Caputo rejected that same attempt and allowed Dr. Thomas to testify. Judge Caputo found him qualified as a medical expert and admitted his expert testimony at trial. In that trial, Dr. Thomas testified that certain prescriptions were not issued in the usual course of professional practice and not for legitimate medical purposes. And in one case in that trial, he opined as to the but-for cause of death.

When Li pressed that issue on appeal to the Third Circuit, the Third Circuit affirmed Judge Caputo's opinion regarding Dr. Thomas' expert testimony.

In another matter that is currently pending before this district, before the Honorable Matthew W. Brann, captioned at United States v. Raymond Kraynak, the Defense sought there to preclude the testimony of Dr. Thomas, for reasons similar to what this Defendant is doing and argues here. The Government previously supplemented its response to the Motion to Preclude with the memorandum opinion authored by Judge Brann denying that motion, which was issued on November 9, 2020 approving the expert testimony of Dr. Thomas, as to the validity of the prescriptions at issue, not issued in the usual course of

```
professional practice and without legitimate medical purpose
00:05
       2
         and the but-for cause of death in that case.
00:05
       3
              Your Honor, I understand that this authority is not
00:05
         binding -- either, Judge Caputo or Judge Brann's decisions are
       4
00:05
       5
         not binding on Your Honor, but we argue that those decisions
00:05
         are persuasive. And we also rely on the additional cases cited
00:05
         in our response brief in support of the admission of
       7
00:05
       8
         Dr. Thomas' testimony.
00.05
       9
              Your Honor, with that, I'm ready to proceed.
00:05
      10
              THE COURT: Who will be questioning here?
00:05
              MR. BRIER: I will, Your Honor. Frank Brier on behalf of
      11
00:05
      12
         Dr. Evers.
00:05
      13
              THE COURT: Mr. Brier, do you wish to make any statement
00:05
      141
         before we begin?
00:05
      15
              MR. BRIER: No, Your Honor. I understand that's argument,
00:05
         it's not evidence. I'm prepared to proceed.
      16
00:05
              THE COURT: Very well. You can call your first witness.
      17
00:05
              MS. OLSHEFSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. The United States
      18
00:06
         calls Dr. Stephen Thomas.
      19
00:06
      20
         STEPHEN
                            THOMAS, M.D. IS CALLED, AND HAVING
00:06
      21
         BEEN DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
00:06
              THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell it for the
      22
00:06
      23
         record.
00:06
      24
              THE WITNESS: My name is Stephen, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, Michael
00:06
         M-I-C-H-A-E-L, Thomas, T-H-O-M-A-S, M.D.
      25 l
00:06
```

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

00:07

2 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, the witness has a binder in

00:07

3

5

8

10

may refer Dr. Thomas to during the testimony. 4

00:07

00:07

The same binder has been provided to the Court, as well as

front of him, which includes exhibits that the United States

6 00:07

Defense counsel.

7 00:07

THE COURT: Thank you.

00.07

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, may I stay at counsel table to

9 question?

00:07

THE COURT: Yes.

11 00:07

00:07

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. OLSHEFSKI: 12 00:07

13 00:07

Q. Good morning, Dr. Thomas.

141 00:07

Good morning. Α.

00:07

15 Q. Please introduce yourself to Your Honor.

00:07

I am Stephen Thomas, I'm a pain medicine physician. 16l A.

17 00:07

THE COURT: Very pleased to meet you.

00:07

18 l BY MS. OLSHEFSKI:

19 00:07

Q. Dr. Thomas, there is a binder in front of you; correct?

20 00:07

Yes. Α.

21 00:07

Q. Can you please turn to Government's Exhibit 1 in that

22 00:07

binder. And can you please let me know if you can identify

23 00:07

Government's Exhibit 1?

24 00:07

Α. Yes, it is my curriculum vitae.

25 00:07

Q. Prior to coming in to court today, did you provide that

- 8 1 curriculum vitae to the United States? 00.07 2 I did. Α. 00:07 3 Q. Is it a current and up-to-date curriculum vitae? 00:07 4 Α. Yes, it was last updated in October of 2020. 00:07 5 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, I move for admission of 00:08 6 Government's Exhibit No. 1. 00:08 7 THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Brier? 00:08 8 MR. BRIER: No objection, Your Honor. 00:08 9 THE COURT: Government's 1 is admitted. 00:08 10 (At this time Government's Exhibit No. 1 was admitted into 00:08 evidence.) 11 00:08 BY MS. OLSHEFSKI: 12 00:08 13 So Dr. Thomas, I'd like to go over some of what is 00:08 included in your curriculum vitae, okay. First of all, what 141 00:08 15 type of physician are you? 00:08 I'm an anesthesiologist by training, with subspecialty **16**l Α. 00:08 training in pain medicine. I am a pain medicine physician. 17 00:08 Are you licensed to practice medicine the Commonwealth of 18I Q. 00:08 19 Pennsylvania? 00:08 20 I have been so since 1992. Α. 00:08 Since 1992? 21 Q. 00:08 22 Α. Yes. 00:08
- your undergraduate education. Where did you go to college?

I want to start first talking about your education, okay,

23 Q.

00:08

00:08 25 A. Initially, I went to Slippery Rock State College, and I

- 00:08 1 took my degree from the Case Western Reserve University in
- 00:08 2 Cleveland, Ohio, majoring in Biology with minor concentrations
- 00:08 3 in Chemistry, Philosophy and Psychology.
- 00:08 4 Q. And after graduating from college, what did you do next?
- 00:09 5 A. I went to medical school at Stanford University School of
- 00:09 6 Medicine, where I obtained my M.D. in 1984. After medical
- 00:09 7 school, I did an internship at The Presbyterian University of
- 00:09 8 Pennsylvania Medical Center, followed by a residency in
- 00:09 9 anesthesiology at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore,
- 00:09 **10 Maryland**.
- 00:09 11 After completing my residency in anesthesiology, I did a
- 00:09 12 Fellowship in pain medicine and regional anesthesia, also, at
- 00:09 13 Johns Hopkins Hospital, where I was the Chief Resident in the
- 00:09 14 Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine.
- 00:09 15 Q. Let me just stop you there for a moment. You performed an
- 00:09 16 internship at the Presbyterian University of Pennsylvania
- 00:09 17 Medical Center; correct?
- 00:09 18 A. Yes.
- 00:09 19 Q. How long was that internship?
- 00:09 20 A. It was one year, a rotating internship, including all
- 00:09 21 medical disciplines the old fashioned way.
- 00:09 22 Q. The residency in anesthesiology at Johns Hopkins Hospital
- 00:10 23 in Baltimore, how long was that, and what did you do as a
- 00:10 24 resident in anesthesiology?
- 00:10 25 A. It was an additional two years of specialty training in

- 00:10
- 00:10
- 00:10
- 00:10 4
- 00:10 5
- 00:10
- 00:10 7
- 00.10
- 00:10
- 00:10 10
- 00:10 11
- 00:10 12
- 00:11 13
- 00:11 14
- 00:11 15
- 00:11 16
- 00:11 17
- 00:11 18
- 00:11 19
- 00:11 20
- 00:11 21
- 00:11 22
- 00:11 23
- 00:11 24
- 00:11 25

- Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine. It included rotations in the division of anesthetics to geriatric individuals, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology and general and regional anesthetics for operative procedures.
 - Q. When we talk about anesthetics and anesthesiology, what is that?
 - A. Anesthesiology is the subspecialty of medicine, specifically, concerned with the provision of appropriate surgical conditions, rendering patients insensible to pain, during the course of operations, and their care in the critical care setting post-operatively, during the periods of recovery from anesthesia, as well as the care of trauma patients and patients in labor and delivery, as well as pediatric patients.

It's a generalist specialty, specifically, concerning the pharmacology, physiology and anatomy of the provision of anesthetics.

- Q. That was two years?
- A. That was a two-year course?
- Q. You indicated that you were Chief Resident of The

 Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine. Did
 you become Chief Resident during that residency?
- A. During my fellowship year, I was appointed Chief Resident.
- Of the 75 residents in the program, four are selected for
- various reasons of excellence in the department to become Chief
- Resident. It is a middle management leadership position within

2

- 00:12
- 00:12
- 4 00:12
- 5 00:12
- 00:12
- 7 00:12
- 8 00.12
- 00:12

9

- 10 00:12
- 11 00:12
- 00:12
- 131 00:12
- 141 00:12
- 15 00:13
- 16 00:13
- 17 00:13
- 18I 00:13
- 19I 00:13
- 20 00:13
- 21 00:13
- 22 00:13
- 23 00:13
- 24 00:13
- 25 00:13

- 1 the department during the course of the year.
 - Q. Now, at some point subsequent to that training, did you find yourself in the military?
 - Actually, I was planning -- since they paid for Stanford, I went to -- I was on reserve duty in the Air Force, during the course of my medical training, and then I owed four years of active duty in the United States Air Force.

I was assigned to the Wright Patterson United States Air Force Medical Center in Dayton, Ohio, where I was the Staff Anesthesiologist. While there, I developed the first pain medicine center for the central region of the Air Force, and 12 rose to the rank of Major and was the Assistant Chief of Anesthesia Services while at Wright Patt. I was there for four years.

- After four years of serving in the military, what did you do then?
- Α. I obtained an Honorable Discharge first, then I returned to my hometown of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where I was Staff Anesthesiologist and Pain Medicine Physician for Pittsburgh Anesthesia Associates, a large anesthesia group covering, approximately, seven hospitals in the Pittsburgh area.

Our main hospital was Mercy Hospital of Pittsburgh, where I initially worked half in the operating room and half in the pain medicine center training residents and providing inpatient, outpatient and subspecialty pain medicine services

00:13 1 across multiple hospitals.

00:13

00:13

00:13

00:14

00:14

00.14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:14

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

00:15

4

5

6

7 I

8

9

10

11

12

13

141

15

16

17 l

18 I

19 l

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 Q. You were one of a group of physicians performing these 3 services?
 - A. Yes, there were 40 anesthesiologists in the group and four pain medicine physicians, so during that time, we provided both inpatient consultation, as well as ran an outpatient clinic for referrals to the pain medicine service.

We also provided services at the Healthsouth Harmarville Rehabilitation Hospital, where we ran a multi-disciplinary chronic pain and function restoration program, concentrating on minimizing drug therapy, improving patient function, dealing with their psychological issues and issues of addiction, regarding their interaction with pain medicines, as well as attempting to return injured workers to work.

- Q. How long did you do that, Dr. Thomas?
- A. I was with Pittsburgh Anesthesia Associates for eight years, from 1992 until 2000.
- Q. So when you were involved in that large group, you indicated that some of the services, anesthesia services, were performed at a hospital, in addition to a clinic, inpatient and outpatient.

How did you divide your time or what was the quantity of -- how was your time divided?

A. When I started, I did 50 percent O.R. anesthesia and 50 percent pain medicine, because they offered me a job with both,

00:15

00:15

00:15 4

00:15 5

00:15

00:16 7

00:16 **č**

9

00:16

00:16 10

00:16 11

00:16 12

00:16 13

00:16 14

00:16 15

00:16 16

00:16 17

00:16 18

00:16 19

00:16 20

00:16 21

00:16 22

00:16 23

00:17 24

00:17 25

and, at the time, that's what I wanted to do. Between 1992 and 1999, I gradually performed more and more pain medicine services because of the demand and less and less operative time.

And in about 1999, I realized that my partners didn't know the dose of intrathecal baclofen for the treatment of spinal spasticity, and I shouldn't have to try to remember everything about anesthesia and pain medicine, so I began to devote 100 percent of my time to my pain medicine practice.

THE REPORTER: Excuse me. Can you repeat that medical term?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I said my partners didn't know the dose of intrathecal baclofen for the treatment of spinal spasticity, therefore, I couldn't keep all the information about anesthesia in my head, as well.

BY MS. OLSHEFSKI:

Q. So since 1999, you have practiced exclusively in pain medicine; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you form a company, at that point, or did you form a name for your practice?

A. Well, once I decided to leave the anesthesia group to concentrate on my practice, both in pain medicine and in medical legal work, I formed the company Pain and Disability Management Consultants, which was, initially, a small physician group of three.

00:17 1

00:17

00:17

00:17

00:17 5

00:17

00:17 7

00:17

00:17

00:17 10

00:17 11

00:18 12

00:18 13

00:18 14

00:18 15

00:18 16

00:18 17

00:18 18

19

00:18 20

00:18

00:18 21

00:18 22

00:18 23

00:18 24

00:19 25

Over the course of the next three years, my partners decided that they needed to have jobs, as opposed to running a practice, and it became my solo private practice from 2002 through 2014.

Q. Just for that period of time, 2002 to 2014, were you treating patients hands on?

A. Oh, yes, during that period, I was seeing a regular outpatient clinic on a daily basis, from 2002 through 2014, as well as doing some inpatient consultation at the hospitals where I was on staff, functioning as a member of the hospital staff and coverage staff for the pain medicine services, where I -- at the hospitals where I worked, as well as admitting some patients for those instances when they required inpatient evaluation and treatment.

Q. Now, I think you used the term, interventional pain management.

A. Yes.

Q. Would you please explain to the Court what that means?

A. The interventional portion of my practice was the performance of injection therapy, nerve blocks and other injections, as well as the implantation of, either, spinal pumps, infusion devices that deliver medications directly to the spinal cord and spinal cord stimulators. The implantation of devices that send electrical nerve impulses to the spinal cord and nerve roots, in order to minimize pain.

00:19

00:19

3

41 00:19

5 00:19

6 00:19

7 00:19

8 00.19

00:19

9

10 00:19

11 00:19

12 00:19

13 00:19

141 00:20

15 00:20

16 00:20

17 00:20

18 I 00:20

19 00:20

20 00:20

21 00:20

22 00:20

23 00:20

24 00:20

251 00:20

The interventional portion of our practice was, approximately, half of our practice, the other portion of our practice was the provision and management of rehabilitative services and medication management for the treatment of chronic pain.

Q. Correct me if I'm wrong, but this was -- these were multiple ways of attacking a patient's pain?

Yes, the subspecialty of pain medicine is the garnering of all of the possible mechanisms by which -- and therapeutics by which we can diminish a patient's pain and improve their function and improve their lives, and, therefore, it includes interventions such as, injections, stimulators, pumps, occasionally, a referral for operation and management of their pain in the post-operative period.

It includes the monitoring and instruction of physical therapists for function restoration, and it includes the psychological support and/or referral of the patients for helping them with the suffering that is the human condition of chronic pain.

But at the same time, we manage the medications that we use in the treatment of pain, trying to get the right medicine to the right people in the right way.

Q. Dr. Thomas, you're Board certified?

Α. I'm certified by The American Board of Anesthesiology. I have a subspecialty certification in Pain Medicine. I've been 00.20

00:21

3 00:21

41 00:21

00:21

5

6 l

9

00:21

7 00.21

00.21

00:21

10 00:21

11I 00:21

12 00:21

13 00:21

141 00:21

15 l 00:21

16 00:22

17 l 00:22

18 I 00:22

19 l 00:22

20 00:22

21 00:22

22 00:22

23 00:22

24 00:22

25 00:22

1 re-certified, now, three times over the course -- since my initial certification. I'm a former Fellow of Interventional Pain from the World Institute of Pain. I am a Certified Independent Medical Examiner from the American Board of Independent Medical Examiners, regarding the evaluation of patients for independent assessment.

I have a Certificate of Competence in Controlled Substances Management and Practice Management from the American Board of Interventional Pain Physicians.

- Q. Now, before I move on, you indicated that you have a Certificate of Competence in the Management of --
- Α. Controlled substances.
- -- Controlled Substances. What does that mean?
- Like all certifications, it's a pencil and paper test after training, regarding the appropriate management of controlled substances, in the treatment of chronic pain, including the controlled substances at issue today, opioids, as well as the management of anti-convulsants, sedatives,
- substances that may interact with -- in the chronic pain setting.

hypnotics, drugs that make you sleepy, and other controlled

- We often hear the term, pain medicine, alongside of, pain Q. management. Can you please distinguish those for us?
- Α. I call my specialty pain medicine because it is about the diagnosis, primarily, and evaluation and long-term treatment of

00:22

00:23

00:23

00:23 5

00:23

00:23 7

00:23

00:23

9

00:23 10

00:23 11

00:23 12

00:23 13

00:24 14

00:24 15

00:24 16

00:24 17

00:24 18

00:24 19

00:24 20

00:24 21

00:24 22

00:24 23

00:24 24

00:24 25

patients with acute chronic and cancer pain. That is what I think about, what I do. Pain management is the term that's applied to the things we do, in order to interfere with pain signals. It is a narrow part of what we do.

I don't call what I do pain management because it concentrates too much on the doing and not enough on the thinking about the overall problems of patients with pain.

- Q. Dr. Thomas, do you still see patients?
- A. I currently see independent medical examinations, I do not have an active clinical practice. So I continue to see one to four independent medical examinees for evaluation of their ongoing treatment, primarily, in the Worker's Compensation setting, at this point.
- Q. I also see on your curriculum vitae that you act as an expert and consultant for The Pennsylvania Medical Society Physician's Health Program. Is that correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is that and what do you do as a consultant?
- A. The Physician's Health Program is a branch of the Pennsylvania Medical Society, particularly concerned with the treatment of impaired physicians, with the most common impairment being addiction.

I have consulted with them in the evaluation of a number of physicians and dentists with chronic pain who have become impaired, secondary to their abuse and addiction to opioid 00:24 1

00:25

00:25

00:25 4

00:25 5

00:25 **6**

00:25

00:25

00:25 10

00:25 11

00:25 12

00:25 13

00:25 14

00:26 15

00:26 16

00:26 17

00:26 18

00:26 19

00:26 20

00:26 21

00:26 22

00:26

23

00:26 24

00:26 25

analgesics and other related drugs. So I've offered them opinions about the fitness of that physician for return to duty and treatment plans associated with the balance of managing their chronic pain and their impairment and how to deal with it.

Also, because of my long-term interest in the problem of addiction, arising from the use of pain medicines, I am a member of The American Society of Addiction Medicine and have lectured on the balance between pain treatment and addiction.

- Q. I also see that you have acted or you continue to act as a consultant for The Department of State Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs. What is that?
- A. That has been in the evaluation of the prescribing of physicians in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also the State of Delaware. The administrative evaluation of physician prescribing of controlled substances and whether or not they were prescribed within the standard of care and within the appropriate professional bounds for both the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Department of Medicine -- I'm sorry -- The Bureau of Medicine, as well as Osteopathy.
- Q. What is that, Doctor?
- A. Doctors are either M.D.'s and are managed by the Board of Medicine or D.O.'s, osteopaths, and they're managed by The Board of Osteopathy. The standards for prescribing, however, are the same.

- 00:26
- 00:26
- 00:27
- 00:27
- 5 00:27
- 6 00:27

- 00:27
- 00:27
- 00:27
- 00:27
- 00:27
- 00:27
- 18I 00:28
- 19 00:28
- 00:28
- 00:28
- 22 00:28
- 00:28
- 00:28
- 00:28

- On your curriculum vitae, Doctor, there is an indication Q.
- that you consult with the Attorney General's Office Medicaid
- Strike Task Force and Drug Task Force for the Pennsylvania AG's
- Office. 41
 - Yes. Α.
 - Q. What do you do for them?
- 7 It is similar to the work that I do for the Department of 00:27
- Justice. Most of the cases I have reviewed for them have been 00.27
- about these particular issues, has the prescribing been for a 9 00:27
- 10 medically legitimate purpose, in the usual course of 00:27
- professional practice, when a patient -- I'm sorry -- when a 11 00:27
- physician has been charged or being investigated for violations **12**l
- 13 of the Pennsylvania Controlled Substances Act, which applies at
 - a State level, as the Federal Controlled Substances Act applies 141
 - **15** at a Federal level.
- So I want to go back one step. When you consult for the 16I Q.
 - 17 l Department of State, regarding professional misconduct alleged
 - against physicians, are you, basically, reviewing what
 - physicians have done, in providing an opinion?
- 20 Yes, I'm reviewing the medical record. Occasionally, there
- are additional -- there's additional information from 21
 - investigation with which I'm provided that I will also take
- into account in the evaluation of the physician's behavior, 23
- 24 but, primarily, it's about prescribing drugs that are used in
- 25 the treatment of pain, primarily, controlled substances.

00:28 1
00:28 2
00:28 3
00:28 4
00:28 5
00:29 6

Q.

00:29

00:29

00:29

00:29

00:29

7

9

11

14

00:29 10

00:29 12

00:29 13

00:29 15

00:29 16

00:30 17

00:30 18

00:30 19

00:30 20

00:30 21

00:30 22

00:30 **23** 00:30 **24**

00:30 25

However, the provision of non-controlled substances, under certain circumstances, have been parts of the -- in the evaluation, particularly, with respect to Medicare or Medicaid fraud.

Now, when you engage in these types of investigations, as

you've just described, what do you perceive your duty to be?

A. My duty is to pull back the veil that stands behind the multi-syllabic words that we use in medicine, and to describe to lay people, precisely, what is happening with the medicine,

That is, to teach people about what medicine is, how medicine should be normatively, how we should be practicing, and to describe deviations, if any, from that north star.

in terms of the standards from inside of medical practice.

- Q. I note there are numerous lectures identified on your curriculum vitae. Have any of those lectures, specifically, focused on the nature and prescribing of controlled substances?
- A. Most of them have, probably, 15 or 20. The issue of controlled substances prescribing has persistently been a problem throughout most of the 21st century, but, particularly, beginning in the ops, about 2005 or so, the issue of controlled substances prescribing and the overuse of medications became progressively a problem.

So talking about how we use controlled substances and how do we -- how should we not use controlled substances in various patient populations, the addicted individual, the injured

- 00.30
- 00:30
- 00:31
- 4 00:31
- 5 00:31
- 6 00:31
- 7 00.31
- 00.31
- 00:31
- 10 00:31
- 00:31
- 00:31
- 00:31
- 00:31
- 15 l 00:32
- **16**l 00:32
- 00:32
- 18I 00:32

- 20 00:32
- 21 00:32
- 22 00:32
- 23 00:32
- 00:32
- 25 00:32

- 1 worker, across the board, has been something that I've talked
- 2 about on a number of occasions. I've offered several trainings
 - to law enforcement to help them identify appropriate controlled
 - substances prescribing and to elucidate where the problems may
 - lie and what are the issues that could portend a problematic
 - prescriber.
 - And you identified law enforcement as being part of the
- audience that you address. Who else would comprise the
- 9 audiences to whom you lecture?
 - Α. I've lectured to community organizations of only lay
 - people and those who are interested in the treatment of 11
- 12 addiction, I've lectured to medical organizations, giving grand
 - 13 rounds at hospitals. So the expansion is broad from lay
 - 141 individuals to medical organizations, as well as law
 - enforcement and anyone who is interested in the problem that
 - has been generated, identified by the CDC in 2011 as the opioid
 - 17 l epidemic.
 - So you're familiar with that term, an opioid epidemic? Q.
 - 19 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Have you, in fact, lecture on, specifically, the opioid
 - epidemic?
 - Yes, I have. Α.
 - Have you, specifically, made presentations or lectured on Q.
- chronic pain? 24
 - Yes, the issue of chronic pain is the reason that we found Α.

- 00.32
- 00:32
- 00:32
- 41 00:32
- 5 00:33
- 00:33
- 7 I 00.33
- 8 00.33
- 9 00:33

Q.

- 10 00:33
- 11 00:33
- 12 00:33
- 13 00:33
- 00:33
- 15 l 00:33
- **16**l 00:33
- 17 l 00:33
- 18I 00:33
- 19 00:33
- 20 00:34
- 21 00:34
- 22 00:34
- 23 00:34
- 24 00:34
- 00:34

- 1 it necessary to liberalize our use of controlled substances 2 and the balance between the treatment of the pain and the treatment of the problems that occur with the increasing use of any medical therapy has been a specific interest of mine.
 - Have you conveyed what you've learned in your knowledge to Q. your colleagues who do the same thing that you do, in terms of lectures or presentations or teachings?
 - Α.
 - Now I also note that, on your curriculum vitae, you are a certified -- you're certified as a DATA Waived Physician. Is
 - that correct?

Yes.

- Α. Yes. I am.
- Q. What does that mean?
- DATA or the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000 allowed 141 Α.
 - physicians in the outpatient setting to treat addiction, which
 - had not had been allowed before. The treatment of addiction,
 - under the DATA waiver is, specifically, limited to Schedule 3
 - substances approved by the FDA for the outpatient treatment of
 - addiction, specifically, buprenorphine in its various forms.
 - The DATA Waived physician undergoes, at least, eight hours
 - of training and is allowed to prescribe buprenorphine for the
 - chronic treatment of the chronic disease of addiction in an
 - outpatient fashion.
 - You mentioned buprenorphine. Would that involve the use of Q.
 - 25 Methadone for treatment of addiction?

1 00.34 00:34 3 00:34 41 00:34 5 00:34 00:34 7 00.34 8 00.35 9 00:35 10 00:35 11 00:35 12 00:35 13 00:35 14I 00:35 **15** 00:35 16 00:35 17 00:35 18I 00:35 19 00:35 20 00:36 21 00:36 22 00:36 23 00:36 24 00:36 25 00:36

A. No, it would not. Methadone is only allowed in the outpatient treatment programs that are specifically licensed by the Federal Government for that purpose. The prescription of Methadone is allowed to physicians for the treatment of pain, but not for the treatment of addiction, which would place it outside of the usual course of professional practice, because it would be beyond the licensing that we hold as providers.

- Q. So is there something unique about Methadone, compared to the other opioids that you have learned that require special training or special caution, when prescribing it?
- A. Beginning in 2007, the FDA placed a black box warning on Methadone and warned that physicians should be especially careful because there was a spike in the number of overdoses associated with the use of Methadone, particularly, the 40 milligram diskette, which was removed from the market for general distribution because of the nature of Methadone.

Methadone differs from all of the other opioids in our rumentarium, our bag of tricks, in that, it is different in its pharmacology from the other drugs. Pharmacology is divided into pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. The way in which the drug moves through the body, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics, the way the drug acts in the body dynamically.

Methadone is the only long-acting opioid that is long acting because of the way the body handles it. Because of that,

- 00:36
- 00:36
- 00:36
- 4 00:36
- 5 00:36
- 00:36
- 7 00:36
- 00.36
- 9 00:36
- 00:37
- 11 00:37
- 00:37
- 00:37
- 00:37
- **15** 00:37
- 16I 00:37
- 00:37
- 18 I 00:37
- 19 00:37
- 20 00:37
- 21 00:37
- 22 00:37
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 25 00:38

- Methadone being a very potent drug, is more potent the more
- that you take it, and that's different from every other drug of
- the opioid-type, which is potent, at the time that you take it,
- and stays at the same potency the more that you take it. It's
- because Methadone builds up in the body, because it's not
- eliminated, and, therefore, after a period of time, it is more
 - potent and more toxic than it would be when you first begin to
 - 8 take the drug.
 - Now, prior to coming in to court, you talked about a black
- 10 box label on Methadone. Did you provide the Government with a
 - Methadone insert that is included in Methadone packages?
- **12**l Yes, it's the prescribing information for Methadone. This
- 13 one is, particularly, for the manufacturer of the brand name
- Dolophine, but Methadone is Methadone, and it contains all of 141
 - the prescribing information that any practitioner prescribing
 - Methadone would be required to know.
 - 17 So I want to, specifically, direct your attention to the
 - Government's Exhibit No. 10 that's in the binder in front of
 - you and ask you if you can identify what Exhibit No. 10 is?
 - Α. Exhibit No. 10 is the Roxane Laboratory prescribing
 - information for Dolophine, Methadone hydrochloride tablets.
 - So is this -- when someone is prescribed Methadone and Q.
- they walk away with a Methadone package, is this the insert 23
- 24 that we all get that is voluminous?
 - Not exactly. The part at the back is the patient

- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38 7
- 00:38
- 00:38
- 00:38 10
- 00:38 11
- 00:38
- 00:38 13
- 00:38 14
- 00:38 15
- 00:38 16
- 00:39 17
- 00:39 18
- 00:39 19
- 00:39 20
- 00:39 21
- 00:39 22
- 00:39 23
- 00:39 24
- 00:39 25

- 1 information. This is the prescribing information that's in the
 2 Physician's Desk Reference, the part that the doctor is
 3 supposed to read.
 - Q. So directing your attention to the first couple paragraphs of Government Exhibit No. 10, you're familiar with what that says; correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Could you read first paragraph for us, please?
 - A. "Deaths. Cardiac and respiratory have been reported during initiation and conversion of pain patients to Methadone treatment from treatment with other opioid agonists. It is critical to understand the pharmacokinetics of Methadone, when converting patients from other opioids. See dosage administration.

"Particular vigilance is necessary during treatment initiation during conversion from one opioid to another and during dose titration."

- Q. What is dose titration?
- A. That is, as you get to the right dose for the patient, generally, the axiom is to start low and go slow. I always -- dose titration, I compare it to salting of food. You don't dump in a whole box of Morton's at the beginning, you start at some and you add to taste.
- The titration of medications is very similar. You start with some, an amount that you know will not be too much, and

- 00:39
- 00:39
- 00:39
- 00:39
- 00:39

5

- 00:39
- 00:39 7
- 00:39
- 00:40
- 00:40 10
- 00:40 11
- 00:40 12
- 00:40 13
- 00:40 14
- 00:40 15
- 00:40 16
- 00:40 17
- 00:40 18
- 00:40 19
- 00:40 20
- 00:40 21
- 00:40 22
- 00:40 23
- 00:40 24
- 00:40 25

- 1 you gradually increase it, in order to get the best possible
 2 effect for the patient, while minimizing side effects and
 - Q. Read the second paragraph, please.

potential harm.

- A. "Respiratory depression is the chief hazard associated with Methadone hydrochloride administration. Methadone's peak respiratory depression effects typically occur later and persists longer than its peak analgesic effects, particularly, in the early dosing period.
- "These characteristics can contribute to cases of iatrogenic overdose, particularly, during treatment initiation and dose titration."
- Q. So Dr. Thomas, is that what you previously testified to, about the, what I'll call the half life of Methadone in the body?
- A. Yes, that is, as Methadone is handled in the body, it builds up, in terms of its dose, because the average half life is about 24 hours, then, it takes about five days for most people, but the half life may be longer, up to 56 hours in some patients, so it will take even longer for them to get to the maximal amount that will in their bodies at what's called steady state.
- Q. Could you read the next paragraph, please?
- A. "In addition, cases of QT interval prolongation and serious arrhythmias, torsades de pointes, have been observed in

```
1 treatment with Methadone. Most cases involve patients being
00.41
       2 treated for pain with large multiple daily doses of Methadone,
00:41
         although, cases have been reported in patients receiving
00:41
         Methadone commonly used for maintenance treatment of opioid
       4
00:41
         addiction."
       5
00:41
       6
         Q.
               And the next one, please.
00:41
       7
               "Methadone treatment for analgesic therapy in patients
00 - 41
         with acute or chronic pain should only be initiated if the
00 - 41
         potential analgesic or palliative care benefit of treatment
       9
00:41
      101
         with Methadone is considered and outweighs the risk."
00:41
               Now, you indicated that this Government's Exhibit No. 7 is
      11
         Q.
00:41
         what the doctor should have and know before prescribing
00:41
      13
         Methadone?
00:41
      14
               It is the most basic information regarding the drug.
         Α.
00:41
      15
               MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, I'd move for admission of
00:41
         Government's Exhibit No. 7.
      16
00:41
      17
               THE COURT: 7?
00:41
               MS. OLSHEFSKI: No. 10, I'm sorry.
00:41
      18
               THE COURT: Mr. Brier?
      19
00:41
      20
               MR. BRIER: No objection, Your Honor.
00:41
               THE COURT: Government 10 is admitted.
      21
00:42
               (At this time Government's Exhibit No. 10 was admitted
      22
00:42
      23
                into evidence.)
00:42
```

 $_{00:42}$ 25 Q. If I were to use the term, Morphine Milligram Equivalents,

BY MS. OLSHEFSKI:

24

00:42

what is that? 00.42

2

41

9

Morphine Milligram Equivalents refers to the fact that all opioids act by the same mechanism. That mechanism is the stimulation or agonism of new receptors, morphine receptors in the brain and spinal cord. Thus, all opioids can be compared to morphine, in order for us to compare drugs that have different 6 names and slightly different characteristics, in terms of their 8 potency.

- So we have been talking about Methadone. Is there Q. something unique about Methadone, even when it comes to equating it to morphine?
- 12 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Tell us what that is.
 - Methadone acutely, that is, the first time that you give it in the short term, is roughly equivalent to Methadone during the first day, so 10 milligrams of Methadone is roughly equivalent to 10 milligrams of morphine.

Once one continues to dose Methadone, then, Methadone, once in the chronic phase, is four times as potent as morphine during its low dose treatment. So from 1 to 20 milligrams per day, Methadone is approximately 4 times as potent as morphine, and so we use a factor of 4 to convert Methadone milligrams to milligrams of morphine equivalents.

So 10 milligrams of Methadone per day is roughly equivalent to 40 milligrams of morphine per day. As we increase

5 00:42

00:42

00:42

00:42

00:42

00:42

00:42

7 I 00.42

10 00:42

11 00:42

00:42

13 00:42

141 00:42

15 00:43

16 00:43

17 l 00:43

18 00:43

19 00:43

20 00:43

21 00:43

22 00:43

23 00:43

24 00:43

25 00:43

00:43 1

00:44 3

00:44 4

00:44 5

00:44

6 l

00:44 7

00:44

00:44

00:44 10

00:44 12

00:44

11

00:44 13

00:44 14

00:44 15

00:45 16

00:45 17

00:45 18

00:45

00:45 20

00:45 21

00:45 22

00:45 23

00:45 24

00:45 25

the dose of Methadone, 20 to 60 is approximately eight times as potent -- I'm sorry 20 to 40 is eight times as potent -- 40 to 60 is 10 times as potent, and over 60 milligrams of Methadone per day, the factor of conversion is 12.

So 100 milligrams of Methadone per day is equivalent to 1200 milligrams of morphine equivalents.

Q. A day?

A. Per day, yes.

Q. I'm going to come back to talking about that in a moment, but I want to get back to your experience.

Can you give us a sense of the types of patients that you have predominantly treated over the 30 years of being a doctor?

A. Yes. Well, my experience with pain patients has been fairly vast. I've worked with thousands of patients with chronic pain, due to headache, neck pain, back pain, limb injuries, neuropathic or nerve pain, spinal cord injuries, multiple work injuries. The most injured person I ever saw was electrocuted as a line man and one of his arms had come off, so he had multiple injuries throughout his joints, bones, nerves and spinal cord.

I have -- the most common -- with all physicians, common things are common, so the most common pains in a pain medicine center are back pain and headache, and so I've treated a lot of back pain and headache. But the pains of degenerative disease have also been part of my practice.

1 00.45

00:45

00:46

00:46

00:46

00.46

00:46

00:46

00:46

For a time, I treated a convent, so nuns live forever, and they live cleanly, so their bodies simply break down, so I've seen a lot of degenerative disease associated with joint, bone,

4 00:46

3

5

6

7 I

9

I've treated neuropathic pain from diabetes postherpetic neuralgia and the like. The pain of headache associated with high pressure hydrocephalus, headache associated with migraine, headache associated with trauma and concussion. So all of the

8 00:46

mechanisms by which pain can occur. Cancer pain, as well, have

10 00:46

been part of the patient population that I've treated over the

11 I years. 00:46

> That would be over, approximately, 30 years? 12 Q.

13 Α. Yes. 00:46

> 14 Q. And we're talking thousands and thousands?

ligament and nerve problems.

15 Α. Yes. 00:46

Can you put a number on the patients that you have 16 Q. 00:46 actually provided care for? 17 00:46

Α. Tens of thousands. 18I 00:46

> 19l Q. I want to talk to you, now, about when you're asked to 20 provide expert opinions, such as in this case, okay?

21 Α. Yes.

22 When you're asked to provide expert services, do you rely Q. 23 on your training that you have just described?

Yes. 24 Α.

> Q. And do you rely on the experience as a medical doctor,

00:46

00:47

00:47

00:47

00:47

00.47

25 00:47

- 00:47 1 pain medicine doctor that you've just described?
- 00:47 2 A. Yes.
- 00:47 3 Q. Now, have you previously testified in courts of law as an
- 00:47 4 expert, in one or more of the various aspects of your medical
- 00:47 5 career?
- 00:47 6 A. I have.
- 00:47 7 Q. Have you previously testified as an expert in criminal
- 00:47 8 cases?
- 00:47 9 A. I have.
- 00:47 10 Q. Would that be both in State Court and Federal Court?
- 00:47 11 A. That is correct, both in Pennsylvania, Delaware and Ohio.
- 00:47 12 Q. Have you previously testified as an expert in civil cases?
- 00:47 13 A. Yes.
- 00:47 14 Q. Would that be in similar -- in Pennsylvania or any other
- 00:48 15 jurisdiction?
- 00:48 16 A. Yes.
- 00:48 17 Q. Now, in the cases -- in civil cases, have you testified
- 00:48 18 for both the Plaintiff and Defendant?
- 00:48 19 A. Yes.
- 00:48 20 Q. In criminal cases, have you testified for both the
- 00:48 21 Prosecution and the Defendant?
- 00:48 22 A. I've only testified for the Prosecution. I've been
- 00:48 23 retained by the Defense on two occasions and rendered opinions
- 00:48 24 but was not called to testify.
- 00:48 25 Q. And I see on your curriculum vitae that you act as a

- 00:48 1 consultant or have acted as a consultant for Cuyahoga
- 00:48 2 County -- Federal -- I'm sorry, the Public Defender's Office in
- 00:48 3 Cuyahoga County?
- 00:48 4 A. Yes, I was retained as an expert for a physician who was
- 00:48 5 charged with prescribing not for a medically legitimate purpose
- 00:48 6 in the usual course of professional practice, and I rendered an
- 00:48 7 opinion but was not called to testify.
- 00:49 8 Q. That was for the Defendant?
- 00:49 9 A. That was for the Defense, yes.
- 00:49 10 Q. Cuyahoga County is located where?
- 00:49 11 A. In Cleveland, Ohio.
- 00:49 12 Q. The nature of the testimony that you've provided in your
- 00:49 13 career, has it involved pain medicine -- your expert opinions
- 00:49 14 -- have those opinions involved pain medicine?
- 00:49 15 A. Pain medicine or anesthesia.
- 00:49 16 Q. Has it involved the cause of death, when pain medicine is
- 00:49 17 involved?
- 00:49 18 A. Yes, on several occasions.
- 00:49 19 Q. Has your expert opinions, have they involved addiction
- 00:49 20 from time to time?
- 00:49 21 A. Yes, they have.
- 00:49 22 Q. And has there ever been a time in a Court of Law when you
- 00:49 23 have been deemed unqualified to testify in these areas?
- 00:49 **24 A. Never.**
- 00:49 25 Q. One more question on that issue. Have you previously been

00:49

3 00:50

4 00:50

5 00:50

6 00:50

7 00:50

00.50

9 00:50

10 00:50

11I 00:50

12 00:50

13 00:50

141 00:50

15 00:50

16I 00:50

17 00:50

18 00:50

19 00:51

20 00:51

21 00:51

22 00:51

23 00:51

24 00:51

25 00:51

1 qualified as an expert to testify in a case such as this, where you're being asked to opine about the propriety of lawfulness -- not lawfulness -- but whether or not prescriptions are issued in the usual course of professional practice for legitimate medical purposes?

Α. Yes, repeatedly.

And also involving a but-for cause of death standard in Q. those cases, have you testified to that?

Yes, I have. Α.

Q. Okay, I want to talk to you about the approach that you took in this case. Specifically, can you advise the Court what you were specifically asked to do in this case?

I was provided with multiple records, and I was asked to evaluate whether or not the prescriptions that were written to Kristina Dame were written for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice. That standard is the standard by which the prescriptions must be evaluated.

As you noted, in civil cases, the standard is different because it's about the standard of care. From a medical point of view, would a physician -- would a responsible physician act in a certain manner.

Particularly, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the standard for whether or not a prescription is provided for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice is defined. Medicine is a regulated

00.51

00:51

00:51

4 00:51

5 00:51

6 00:51

7 00.51

00.51

9 00:51

10 00:51

11 I 00:52

12 00:52

13 00:52

141 00:52

15 l 00:52

16 00:52

17 l 00:52

18I 00:52

19 00:52

20 00:52

21 00:52

22 00:52

23 00:52

00:52

25 00:52

1 industry and physicians are responsible for knowing those 2 regulations and definitions. In Pennsylvania, a prescription must be written in good faith, within the scope of the doctor-patient relationship and in accordance with the accepted treatment principles of any responsible segment of the medical community.

And that standard is the standard by which I would evaluate a prescription written by a physician in the Commonwealth.

- Q. In fact, is that a standard that you have been held to throughout your entire career?
- Α. Absolutely.
- Q. So you were asked to do that. Did you, in fact, do that?
- Yes. Α.
- Q. So I'm going to talk to you for a moment but the records that you reviewed, regarding Kristina Dame. Do you recall off the top of your head or can you give us a sense of your recollection of what you reviewed?
- I immediately turned to my -- I've reviewed a lot of Α. records about Ms. Dame. I reviewed a separate set for my first report and then reviewed a larger set that was -- that included the first set for my second report.
- Okay, so let's start with the actual -- Kristina's actual Q. medical file from the Defendant Martin Evers. Did you review that medical file?

- 00:52 1 A. I did.
- 00:52 2 Q. And did you review the autopsy report related to
- 00:53 3 Kristina's death?
- 00:53 4 A. I did.
- 00:53 5 Q. Did you review the toxicology report associated with
- 00:53 6 Kristina Dame's death?
- 00:53 7 A. Yes.
- 00:53 8 Q. Did you review medical records that were provided by the
- 00:53 9 coroner in certain office notes, at the time of Kristina's
- 00:53 10 death, which was September 11, 2014?
- 00:53 11 A. I did.
- 00:53 12 Q. Did you look at and review prescriptions that were
- 00:53 13 prescribed to Kristina Dame by the Defendant?
- 00:53 14 A. Yes.
- 00:53 15 Q. Did you review an interview that was conducted by the DEA
- 00:53 16 Agent of Kristina's mother Margaret Dame?
- 00:53 17 A. Yes.
- 00:53 18 Q. Did you review an interview of the Defendant, at the time
- 00:53 19 of a search warrant and/or arrest?
- 00:53 20 A. I reviewed the transcript, initially, and later I watched
- 00:54 21 a video of the interview.
- 00:54 22 Q. Now, we're going to talk a little bit more in a moment
- 00:54 23 about the PDMP report. In this case, did you review the
- 00:54 24 Prescription Drug Monitoring Report for Kristina Dame?
- 00:54 25 A. I did.

- 00:54 1 Q. Do you have a recollection of reviewing hospital records
- 00:54 2 from Wayne Memorial Hospital?
- 00:54 3 A. I reviewed those later.
- 00:54 4 Q. But you did review them?
- 00:54 5 A. Yes.
- 00:54 6 Q. How about hospital records from First Valley Hospital for
- 00:54 7 Kristina Dame?
- 00:54 8 A. First Health.
- 00:54 9 Q. How about records from the Horsham Clinic? Do you recall
- 00:54 10 reviewing those?
- 00:54 11 A. Yes, I do.
- 00:54 12 Q. Did you review any hospital records from Bon Secours?
- 00:54 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 00:54 14 Q. How about Geisinger Hospital records for Kristina Dame?
- 00:54 15 Did you review those?
- 00:54 16 A. I did.
- 00:54 17 Q. Did you review the Pennsylvania State Police reports
- 00:54 18 regarding Kristina's death?
- 00:54 19 A. I did.
- 00:54 20 Q. Did you, also, have an opportunity to review photographs
- 00:54 21 of the scene of Kristina's death?
- 00:55 22 A. I did.
- 00:55 23 Q. Can you give us a sense of the volume of pages of records
- 00:55 24 that you have reviewed, prior to reaching opinions and/or
- 00:55 25 conclusions?

- 00:55 1 A. It would be, at least, 7 or 8,000 pages of records.
- Q. So let's talk about the approach that you took or what I
- 00:55 3 will refer to as your methodology.
- 00:55 4 A. Yes.
- 00:55 5 Q. Do you have a methodology that you follow, when you're
- 00:55 6 asked to do what you were asked to do in this case?
- 00:55 7 A. I do.
- 00:55 8 Q. Can you please explain that approach or methodology to the
- 00:55 9 Court?

00:56

00:56

00:56

00:56

00:56

00:56

00:57

20

21

24

25 l

- 00:55 10 A. Well, the most important thing is to not miss anything, so
- 00:55 11 I read, virtually, all of the record, except where -- because
- 00:55 12 of the nature of medical records, they tend to be very
- 00:55 13 repetitive, so a lot of it is page-turning, but paying
- 00:56 14 particular attention to those instances where the physicians
- 00:56 15 made direct entries of, either, observations of the patient or
- 00:56 16 recommendations, relative to the patient's care.

Putting that into a chronological pattern, in order to

00:56 18 determine which of the things that were recommended or observed

19 by physicians occurred in what order, because that order

becomes important, and to the extent possible, attempting to

determine what parts of her care that was provided in the

22 necessary fragmented nature of the current U.S. medical system

23 was communicated from doctor to doctor, in order to know what

the information base upon which the Defendant was making

decisions and whether or not that was adequate for the

00:57 1 decisions made.

Additionally, determining over the course of time how the patient was responding to treatment and were there observations made both by the Defendant and by other physicians that would allow a clear reckoning of her overall condition.

Included in there because of the nature of the care was whether or not information was being provided to the Defendant from other sources that would allow him to have a fulsome view of the patient's condition.

Part of that evaluation is based upon my training, experience and knowledge of the drugs involved and the diagnoses, both psychological, as well as -- which psychological diagnoses are medical -- but psychological and physical, in terms of determining what that patient would look like and what things would be expected to be occurring with her, in the usual course of professional practice.

Then, taking all of that information, in terms of history, physical examination, diagnostic data, consultation and the temporal arrangement of those, comparing those, first, to the standard treatment protocols, which are determined by the various guidelines and regulations that physicians follow or physicians should follow, in the provision of medical care, and trying to make a determination about, A, Is the treatment first within the standard guideline package, that is, if a physician were to follow all of the guidelines, that would be putative

00:57 00:57

00:57

2

3

4

5

00:57600:57700:578

00:57 **9**00:57 **10**

00:581100:581200:5813

00:581400:5815

00:58 16 00:58 17

00:58
18
00:58
19
00:58
20
00:58
21

00:59 **22** 00:59 **23**

00:59 24

25 l

00:59

00:59 **2**00:59 **3**00:59 **4**00:59 **5**

00.59

00:59

00:59 7 00:59 8 01:00 9 01:00 10

6

11I

01:00 **12** 01:00 **13**

01:00

01:00 **14** 01:00 **15**

01:00 16

01:00 17

01:00

18

01:00 19

01:00 20

01:00 21

01:00 22

01:00 23

01:00 24

01:01 25

evidence that the prescribing was for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice, because it would be virtually impossible to be within the safe harbor of the guidelines and not be prescribing for a medically legitimate purpose.

Secondarily, if the guidelines are not followed then to what extent does that occur? Because there are simple mistakes which are expected. There are omissions or commissions which are unexpected but simply bad medicine. There are occurrences that occur that are negligent, but even that would not be not for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice.

In order to make the determination that the prescribing is not for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice, the behavior must be so far from the center line of what we should do, as to be unrecognizable as the practice of medicine.

And it is then and only then that I would make that determination.

Q. So I want to talk to you about -- well, did you do all that in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. So let's talk about the -- some of the authorities that you relied on, as you're working your way through those thousands and thousands of pages, okay. Are there different

1 categories of authorities that you rely on, as support for your $01 \cdot 01$

01:01

01:01

01 • 01

knowledge and opinions in reaching conclusions?

3 01:01

Α.

4

7

Yes.

Q. Okay, and what are the different kinds of categories?

5 01:01

I think, first, there are the -- the plain statement of Α.

the law that governs the practice of medicine. It is not a

01:01

legal opinion to understand that a prescription must be written

01:01

for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of

9 01:01

professional practice as being the standard by which I would be

10 01:01

evaluating any physician's behavior in this context.

11 01:01

Further, it's not a legal opinion, but the standard that

12 01:01

the Pennsylvania Controlled Substances Act describes what that is for patients in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and using

141

01:01

01:01

13

that to evaluate the behavior.

15 01:02

Then, I would turn to the administrative sources,

16I 01:02

particularly, the PA code 15.92, which -- Title 21 15.92, which

17 l 01:02

states the prescribing, dispensing and administering of

18I 01:02

prescriptions and what is expected of a physician,

19 01:02

administratively, in the course of performing that activity.

Then, I think I would turn, then, to more medical sources

20 01:02

but that still tend to be administrative. For example, the

21 01:02

22 01:02

Federation of State Medical Boards Model Policy For Use of

23 01:02

Opioids in the Treatment of Chronic Pain. That document has

24 01:02

been updated multiple times. It was first published in 1998,

25 01:02

updated in 2004 and then in 2013 and using those sequential

01:03 **1** 01:03 **2**

3

01:03 **4** 01:03 **5**

01:03

01:03

01:03

01:04

01:04

01:03 **7** 01:03 **8**

9

12

16

20

25

01:03 **10**

01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15

01:04 17 01:04 18

01:04 19

01:04

01:05

01:04 21 01:04 22 01:05 23 01:05 24 updates, as part of the temporal overlay in time during which the prescribing occurred.

Because, virtually, all of the records that I -- the records here with Ms. Dame, the 2013 model policy was utilized, using the descriptions in the model policy of what the physician should do, and, in fact, what are the areas in which The Federation of State Medical Boards of which Pennsylvania is a signatory had described problematic prescribing by physicians, in order to alert physicians as to what we should be doing, at that point, that was not as clearly outlined in the 2004 model policy.

Then, the CDC guidelines, which I did not apply to Ms. Dame but to other patients that I have reviewed, because the CDC guidelines were not published until March of 2016, and, therefore, a physician would not be responsible for the CDC guidelines in the evaluation of their prescribing behavior, even though, some of the information that is in the CDC guidelines was being put into the milieu of our prescribing over the period between 2013 and 2016.

Additionally, I used the medical literature, the medical literature that, initially, allowed and encouraged physicians to liberalize their prescribing. The consensus statement on The Use of Opioids in the Treatment of Chronic Pain published by The American Pain Society and The American Academy of Pain Medicine in 1996 represented a C-change in the way in which we

01:05 **2**

01:05

01:05 4

01:05

01:05

5

01:05 7

01:05

01:06

01:06 **11**

10

01:06 13

01:06 14

01:06 15

01:06 16

01:06 17

01:06

18I

01:06 19

01:06 20

01:06 21

01:07 22

01:07 23

01:07 24

01:07 25

prescribe opioid analgesics, but then the warnings from the FDA that came, particularly, in 2004 and 2007, with the declaration of opioid epidemic in 2011, is part of the back-drop for utilizing the medical information.

And, particularly, the guidelines published by The American Pain Society and an article by Dr. Roger Chou in 2009, also, represents the underlying medical basis of the evaluation of the center line of opioid prescribing, that is, the normative practice of how we should prescribe opioids.

I think it's important to say that the guidelines, however, are mostly descriptive and encourage a certain normative behavior. Very rarely do the guidelines say, Don't do "X". They imply not to do "X" because they say do "Y", and if you do "Y", you won't do "X". But very rarely is anything in medical practice laid out to say, A doctor should never do "X", "Y" or "Z".

So the guidelines are not directly related to the determination of whether or not prescribing is for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice, that is, actually, a judgment based upon how far from the guidelines and the normative practice the prescribing is.

Q. I'm just going to go through some of those authorities that you identified in a lit bit more detail. But before I do that, everything that you've just described, has it been your practice, in rendering expert opinions, to rely on all of

- 01:07 1 those?
- 01:07 2 A. It has been my practice in rendering expert opinions and
- 01:07 3 my practice in writing thousands of prescriptions to rely upon
- 01:07 4 those.
- 01:07 5 Q. You mentioned medical associations and medical boards. In
- 01:07 6 Pennsylvania, particularly, is there -- I think you mentioned a
- 01:07 7 code, The Pennsylvania Code in Pennsylvania that provides
- 01:07 8 guidelines for physicians?
- 01:07 9 A. Yes.
- 01:07 10 Q. So is that true?
- 01:07 11 A. Yes, it is.
- 01:07 12 Q. So I want to direct your attention to, specifically,
- 01:07 13 Government's Exhibit No. 8 in the binder in front of you.
- 01:08 14 A. Yes, Title 49, 1692.
- 01:08 15 Q. Are you familiar with that part of the Pennsylvania Code
- 01:08 16 identified as prescribing, administering and dispensing
- 01:08 17 controlled substances?
- 01:08 18 A. Yes.
- 01:08 19 Q. Again, this is -- these are guidelines in this part of the
- 01:08 20 Pennsylvania Code that you routinely rely on; correct?
- 01:08 **21 A.** Yes.
- 01:08 22 Q. And, in particular, what is this Pennsylvania Code Section
- 01:08 23 16.92, which is Title 49, what does it advise physicians that
- 01:08 24 they should do?
- 01:08 25 A. When I read the 1692, I basically hear the code saying,

01 . 08

01:09

3 01:09

01:09

4

5

9

01:09

6 01:09

7 01.09

 $01 \cdot 09$

01:09

10 01:09

11 01:09

12 01:09

13 01:09

14 01:09

01:09

16 01:09

17 l 01:10

18I 01:10

19 l 01:10

20 01:10

21 01:10

22 01:10

23 01:10

24 01:10

25 01:10

Make sure you practice medicine, when you're giving out controlled substances, because harm can occur. It says we should initially evaluate the patient with history and physical. It says that we should re-evaluate the patient at intervals to make sure that the medication we're giving them is causing -- is doing good and not doing harm.

It says we should counsel patients about the pros and cons of the medication. And this is particularly true with controlled substances and opioids, because these are, at the very least, they are habituating and, at worst, they are addictive. And that we should keep medical records that say what is -- what have we been trying to do with the medication and what do we see as the effect of the medication.

And have we done those things, in terms of instructing the patient and giving them directions about how to use the drug that will make it most effective. And that we should comply with the current standards in prescribing the drugs.

And, particularly, particular to this case, did you, in fact, rely on that section of the Pennsylvania Code titled, Prescribing, Administering and Dispensing Controlled Substances, Section 1692, in reaching the opinions and conclusions that you reached in this case?

Α. Yes, it is background information.

Q. Are you familiar with the Title 21 CFR Section 1306.04,

and that is Government's Exhibit No. 5?

- 01:10 1 A. Yes, I am.
- 01:10 2 Q. What is that?
- 01:10 3 A. That is the purpose of issuing a prescription, it is the
- 01:10 4 description that the prescription must be issued for a
- 01:10 5 medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of
- 01:10 6 professional practice.
- 01:10 7 Q. So this is a Code of Federal Regulations that is informing
- 01:11 8 a practitioner about what the requirements are for a
- 01:11 9 prescription to be valid. Would that be accurate?
- 01:11 10 A. That is correct.
- 01:11 11 Q. Can you just, please, read the first section, which is
- 01:11 12 Subsection A of Title 21 -- I'm sorry -- 21 CFR Section
- 01:11 13 1306.04?
- 01:11 14 A. "A. A prescription for controlled substance to be
- 01:11 15 effective must be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an
- 01:11 16 individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his
- 01:11 17 professional practice. The responsibility for the proper
- 01:11 18 prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the
- 01:11 19 prescribing practitioner, but a corresponding responsibility
- 01:11 20 rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription.
- 01:11 21 "An order purporting to be a prescription issued not in
- 01:11 22 the usual course of professional treatment or in legitimate and
- 01:11 23 authorized research is not a prescription within the meaning
- 01:11 24 and intent of the section. A person knowingly fulfilling a
- 01:12 25 purported prescription, as well as the person issuing it, shall

01:12

01.12

01:12 3

01:12

4

9

13 l

01:12 5

01:12 6

01:12

01:12

01:12 **10**

01:13 12

01:13 14

01:13

01:131501:131601:1317

01:13 18

01:13

01:13 20

19

01:13 21

01:13 22

01:13 23

01:14

01:14 25

24

be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the provisions of law relating to controlled substances."

- Q. Now, I see the words, corresponding responsibility, when talking about pharmacists. Can you explain that to us, please?
- A. In the practice of medicine, the issuing of a prescription to a patient occurs in a particular setting, and that setting is a triad, which involves the prescribing physician, the issuing pharmacist and the patient who is the end user.

While the physician is responsible for the decision-making in determining that a prescription should be issued, the pharmacist has a responsibility to use his knowledge, training and, indeed, observations of the patient, in order to alert the physician, from time to time, of things that the physician may or may not know.

And the patient bears a responsibility, although, not at the same level of professionalism as the physician and the pharmacist, to alert the physician and the pharmacist to things that the physician or pharmacist may or may not know.

It is in that triad, which is not -- in which all parties are a part, but which the professional responsibilities lie with the physician and the pharmacist, in terms of the level of knowledge training, education and understanding of the underlying pharmacology that is required, in order to legitimize the prescription of a controlled substance.

Q. Did you rely on this particular section of the CFR

- ol:14 1 identified in Government's Exhibit No. 5 in reaching the
- 01:14 2 opinions and conclusions that you reached in this case?
- 01:14 3 A. This is the gold standard, this is the standard by which
- 01:14 4 the opinion must be based or it would not be valid.
- 01:14 5 Q. I want to direct your attention, now, to Government's
- 01:14 6 Exhibit No. 6. Are you familiar with what Government's Exhibit
- 01:14 7 No. 6 is?
- 01:14 8 A. Yes.
- 01:14 9 Q. And is it correct that you have in front of you Title 21
- 01:14 10 United States Code Section 829 titled, Prescriptions?
- 01:14 11 A. Yes.
- 01:14 12 Q. If you go to the second page of Government No. 6, you see
- 01:15 13 Subsection E2, Subsection 2 on the second page, where it says,
- 01:15 14 As used in this subsection?
- 01:15 15 A. Yes.
- 01:15 16 Q. Okay. Is this another area of the title -- is this a
- 01:15 17 definitional area of Section 829 of Title 21, which, again,
- 01:15 18 defines a valid prescription?
- 01:15 19 A. Yes, it does. It alerts the physician as to what the
- 01:15 20 requisite parameters for the issuance of a valid prescription
- 01:15 **21 is**.
- 01:15 22 Q. Under Title 21 Section 829, how is a valid prescription
- 01:15 23 defined?
- 01:15 24 A. Again, it's repeated that it's issued for a legitimate
- 01:15 25 medical purpose in the usual course of professional practice,

- 01 15
- 01:15
- 01:16
- 01:16
- 5 01:16
- 6 01:16
- 7 01 - 16
- 8 01:16
- 9 01:16
- 01:16
- 01:16
- 01:16

- 01:16
- 01:16
- **16**l 01:16
- 17 l 01:16
- 18I
- 01:16

01:17

01:17

- 21 01:17

- 01:17
- 01:17

01:17

- 25

- 1 and that the practitioner has conducted an in-person -- at
- 2 least, one in-person examination of the patient or they're a
 - covering practitioner, which would be a person who is, instead
- of the physician, covering for their practice. 4
 - So would you agree with me that this is a definitional Q.
 - section of that title?
 - Α. It is.
 - Did you rely, also, on this section in Government's
 - Exhibit No. 6 in reaching the opinions and conclusions that you
- 10 reached in this case?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. I want to direct your attention to one more part of
- Pennsylvania direction, which is found at Government's Exhibit 01:16
 - 4. And in Government's Exhibit 4, are you familiar with Chapter 141
 - 15 25 of the Controlled Substance Drugs, Devices and Cosmetics Act
 - the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?
 - Yes. Α.
 - And does this particular act also define what a valid Q.
 - 19 prescription is?
 - 20 Yes. Α.
 - Q. So once -- I'd ask that you turn to the next page of
- Government's Exhibit 4 Section 25.52, where it says, Purpose. 22 01:17
 - Do you see that? 23
 - Yes. 24 Α.
 - Q. And could you please read the subsection A?

- 01:17 1 A. "A. A prescription for controlled substance must be issued
- 01:17 2 for a legitimate medical purpose by a licensed practitioner in
- 01:17 3 the usual course of professional practice. The responsibility
- 01:17 4 for proper prescribing of controlled substances is upon the
- 01:17 5 practitioner, but a corresponding responsibility rests with the
- 01:17 6 pharmacist who dispenses the medication and interprets the
- 01:17 7 directions of the prescriber to the patient."
- 01:17 8 Q. So would you agree with me this is a definitional section
- 01:17 9 of the purpose of a prescription under Pennsylvania -- under
- 01:17 10 the Pennsylvania drug laws?
- 01:17 11 A. Yes.
- 01:17 12 Q. We previously went over how the CFR defines a valid
- 01:18 13 prescription; correct?
- 01:18 14 A. That is correct.
- 01:18 15 Q. Under Federal law.
- 01:18 16 A. Yes.
- 01:18 17 Q. And did you rely on Chapter 25 and, particularly, Section
- 01:18 18 2552, in reaching your opinions and conclusions in this case?
- 01:18 19 A. That is the definition that I used.
- 01:18 20 Q. Now, you mentioned another policy, and I'm going to direct
- 01:18 21 your attention to Government's Exhibit No. 7. I think you
- 01:18 22 talked about the state medical boards.
- 01:18 23 A. Yes.
- 01:18 24 Q. You spent some time talking about revisions and updates,
- 01:18 25 and the most recent one being in 2013; is that correct?

- 01:18 1 A. The most recent one to which I referred in this case, the
- 01:18 2 most recent one is actually in 2019.
- 01:18 3 Q. So do you recognize what Government's Exhibit No. 7 is?
- 01:18 4 A. Yes.
- 01:19 5 Q. What is it?
- 01:19 6 A. It is The Federation of State Medical Board's Model Policy
- 01:19 7 on Use of Opioid Analgesics and Treatment of Chronic Pain,
- 01:19 8 revised July 2013.
- 01:19 9 Q. You indicated that Pennsylvania -- the Commonwealth of
- 01:19 10 Pennsylvania is a signatory to this policy. What did you mean
- 01:19 11 by that?
- 01:19 12 A. That is -- The Federation of State Medical Boards is a
- 01:19 13 group that is comprised of the state medical boards of the
- 01:19 14 various states and municipalities and territories of the United
- 01:19 15 States, and 49 -- not all of the states are signatories to The
- 01:19 16 Federation of State Medical Board's Model Policy, Pennsylvania
- 01:19 17 is one of the states that is part of that organization.
- 01:19 18 Q. What does that mean to be a signatory?
- 01:19 19 A. It means that they've adopted the guidelines, as part of
- 01:20 20 their medical board policy. The State Medical Board -- the
- 01:20 21 Pennsylvania Medical Board initially sent out, in 1998, a copy
- 01:20 22 of the model policy, and then in about 2009, they mailed to
- 01:20 23 every practicing physician in the Commonwealth a book called
- 01:20 24 Responsible Opioid Prescribing, and they have been part
- 01:20 25 of -- this is part of the background guidance from the

- 01:20 1 Pennsylvania State Medical Board.
- Q. Now, did you rely on the model policy on the use of opioid
- 01:21 3 analgesics in the treatment of chronic pain in reaching your
- 01:21 4 opinions and conclusions in this case?
- 01:21 5 A. Yes, it is one of the -- it is the guidance for
- 01:21 6 appropriate prescribing, and it highlights areas of difficulty
- 01:21 7 in opioid prescribing for physicians of which physicians would
- 01:21 8 be aware.
- 01:21 9 Q. These guidelines in the definitional sections of certain
- 01:21 10 codes, both in Pennsylvania and under the Federal realm, in
- 01:21 11 your view, do they cater to the idiosyncrasies of physicians or
- 01:21 12 are they objective? Are they allowed to cater to the
- 01:21 13 idiosyncrasies of any particular physician?
- 01:22 14 A. Well, no, to the extent that medicine is a scientific
- 01:22 15 practice, then, we must take the data that we gain through both
- 01:22 16 experimentation, observation and experience and apply that to
- 01:22 17 the treatment of patients. With respect to the prescribing of
- 01:22 18 opioid analgesics, this has become part of the data of the
- 01:22 19 public health milieu of the United States.
- 01:22 20 Q. What do you mean by that?
- 01:22 21 A. At the point at which we began to have the wave of opioid
- 01:22 22 overdoses, leading to the declaration by Centers for Disease
- 01:22 23 Control that we have a public health problem, which they
- 01:22 24 labeled an opioid epidemic because of the high rate of use of
- 01:22 25 the drugs, the high rate of complications in use of the drugs,

01.23 21 01:23

4 01:23

01:23

01:23

01.23

3

5

6

71

01:23

8 01:23

9 01:23 10 01:23

11 01:23

121 01:23

13 01:23

141 01:24

15 01:24

16 01:24

17 01:24

18I 01:24

19 01:24 20

21 01:24

01:24

22 01:24

23 01:24

24 01:25

25 01:25

1 the harms associated with the high dose -- with the use of high dose opioids, that was so wide spread -- had become so wide spread that it impacts upon the public health.

Indeed, over the course of the last decade, we have seen the life expectancy of people in America fall, in part, related to deaths associated with the use of controlled substances. That is a public health problem.

And that public health problem is translated into both the guidance from the state medical board and the alerts to physicians that the iatrogenic part, the part for which we, as physicians, are responsible, is within our control and that we must, first, do no harm.

- In your opinion, Dr. Thomas, what is the hall mark, in Q. your opinion, of practicing or issuing prescriptions, within the usual course of professional practice and for legitimate medical purposes?
- Yes. To be able to identify that process, because it is not a point determination, it is a process, it is;

Has the physician taken appropriate history? Asked the patient the questions that are necessary, in order to determine whether or not the use of a controlled substance is appropriate? Has the physician gathered the information that comes in the form of physical examination, to determine whether or not the use of a controlled substance could be beneficial to the patient and what the effectiveness or lack thereof is of

1 the medication on the patient?

Has the physician appropriately observed those things that would be expected to be impacted by the use of the drug, in order to determine whether or not the drug is causing harm.

So, for example, in high dose opioid treatment, if someone is taking a lot of drug, I expect them to look like they're taking a lot of drug, and, therefore, I need to be watching for, Are they intoxicated? How do they walk? What are the hall marks of problematic drug use?

Further, Has the physician, particularly, in the period at hand, have they conducted satisfactory pharmacovigilance? By that is, are you being careful with the drug? Being careful with a controlled substance includes prescribing to the patients so that they don't have too much drug on hand and regularly, based upon the prescription.

It includes the occasional occurrence of a pill count. When the patient is using the drugs appropriately, occasionally, counting to make sure they are using what they're instructed to use and not using more than that. And the only way to determine that is to have them bring in their pills and you count them.

From time to time, depending upon the risk stratification of the patient, that is, some people and some drugs are riskier than other people and other drugs. So high doses of Methadone are riskier than low doses of oxycodone.

01:25 **2**01:25 **3**01:25 **4**

5

10

01.25

01:25

01:25

01:25 **6**01:25 **7**01:25 **8**01:25 **9**

01:25 11 01:26 12 01:26 13 01:26 14 01:26 15

01:26 16 01:26 17 01:26 18 01:26 19

01:26

01:26

01:26

20

21

24

01:26 **22** 01:26 **23**

01:26 25

1 01.27 01:27 3 01:27

5 01:27

01:27

01:27

01:27

01:27

01:27

4

6 l

9

11

7 01.27 01.27

10 01:27

12 01:27 13

14 01:28

15 01:28

16I 01:28

17 l 01:28

18 01:28

19I 01:28

20 01:28

21 01:28

22 01:28

23 01:28

24 01:28

25 01:28

People who have a history of substance abuse, overdose, drug-seeking behavior or treatment for any of those things are high risk patients and, therefore, must be observed more frequently.

Among the clinical observations, as well as laboratory observations, is urine drug screening. Testing to see, Does the patient have the expected drug in their system with the absence of unexpected drugs? Urine drug screening provides objective evidence of the appropriate use of the drug by the patient and the appropriate non-use of the drug by the patient.

A urine drug screen is not a test that one passes or fails. A urine drug screen provides objective evidence that is either expected, the drug that the physician is prescribing is present, it's presents in reasonable quantities, without adulterants and is regularly present, and the drugs that the patient is not prescribed are not present or it's unexpected. Either of those things is not true.

- Now, in staying in that same line of approach that you have just testified to, how important is patient selection and individualized care? Are you familiar with those terms?
- Α. Absolutely.
- So could you please tell us what they are and how Q. important they are?
- So every article that I've read in the last 20 years, Α. regarding the use of opioids for the treatment of chronic pain,

01:29 01:29 4

5

01.28

01:29

01:29

01:29 7 01.29 01.29 9 01:29 10 01:29 11 01:29

13 01:29 141 01:29 15 01:30

01:29

12

16 01:30 17 l 01:30 18I 01:30 19 01:30 20 01:30 21 01:30 22 01:30 23 01:30 24 01:30

25 l

01:30

has contained a sentence that says, The use of opioids in the treatment of non-cancer pain is controversial. There is no clear evidence that these drugs are safe and effective for that purpose, or something to that effect.

Therefore, the axiom that some things work for some people some time is always applied to the use of these drugs. Being assured that a patient is appropriate for the use of the drug, achieves the expected effect, that is, that there is a decrease in pain intensity and increase in their function that is documented and that occurs with a reasonable dose of the drug, such that harm is not expected to occur.

It is, basically, the process of plucking the rose and leaving the thorns. Because we know with these drugs that the higher the dose, the more likely the harm. The longer the use the more likely the harm.

And if the patient is poorly selected, that is, someone who will not take the medications appropriately, who will abuse the medications, who has psychological difficulties with impulse control, which represent risk factors for non-medical use of the drug, all of those things increase the likelihood of harm, and anything that increases the likelihood of harm requires the physician to be more vigilant, more careful, and to minimize that potential harm, because everything about the practice and the public health information and the data that we have about the use of these drugs suggests that that is the

01:30 1 appropriate thing to do.

knew, right from the start -- if all you saw, right from the start, was high doses of opioids, as you would interpret high doses of opioids to be, over a long period of time, in your view, would that be -- would that cause you to look further?

A. Yes, and, in fact, doses greater than 19 milligrams of morphine equivalents is the initial point at which one begins to look further, and certainly, with doses greater than 200 milligrams of morphine equivalents, we know that the patient, over the course of a 3 to 5 year period, has a three percent chance of death, and, therefore, is, on its face, it is a risky endeavor.

So if you were to approach a patient's file and all you

It should occur rarely, and, particularly, if it were occurring frequently, that would increase the likelihood that the prescribing was inappropriate at best.

- Q. Now, when you are asked to determine the legitimacy of prescribing, do you rely on whether or not a patient says, "I liked what the doctor was prescribing for me"?
- A. No, that's not a medical standard. Drug-liking is a -- it is a medical term, it is the term that we use for, if we give a patient a drug in a blinded fashion, how many people, particularly, those who have substance use disorder, will say,
- particularly, those who have substance use disorder, will say,"I like that drug".

A patient liking what they are getting is not a medical

01:30 **3** 01:31 **4**

01:30

01:31

2

01:31 6

01:31 7

01:31

01:31

01:31 10

01:31 11

01:31 12

01:31 13

01:31 14

01:31 15

01:31 16

01:32 17

01:32 18

01:32 19

01:32 20

01:32 21

01:32 22

01:32 23

01:32 24

01:32 25

01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33

5

7

01.33

6 01:33

01:33

01.33

01.33 9 01:33 10 01:33

11 01:33 12

13 01:33

01:33

141 01:33

15 01:34

16 01:34

17 l 01:34

18 I 01:34

19 01:34

20 01:34

21 01:34

22 01:34 23 01:34

25 l 01:34

01:34

24

standard for determining legitimacy, the determination of legitimacy is based upon the practice of medicine, adequate history, adequate physical examination, appropriate pharmacovigilance and responding to the information that the physician gains about whether or not to write the next prescription.

Because if one doesn't do adequate history, physical examination, pharmacovigilance, testing, diagnosis, and one ignores the information gained, such that you're giving a drug to a patient who should not have it, based upon the practice of medicine that has preceded it, then, that prescription is not for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice, because it ignores the accepted treatment principles of any responsible segment of the medical community.

- What is risk mitigation in the prescribing of controlled Q. substances?
- We know risk, generally, is the probability of loss, the probability of a bad outcome. So how do we minimize the probability of a bad outcome for a patient who is prescribed controlled substances?

We do that by patient selection. We determine whether or not there are things about this patient that we know beforehand that would increase the likelihood of a bad outcome, a history of personal substance abuse, a history of alcohol abuse, heavy

01:35 01:35 4 01:35 5 01:35 6 01:35 7 01.35

01 - 34

8 9 01:35 10 01:35 11 01:35

12

01 - 35

01:35

13 01:35 141 01:35 15 01:36 16 01:36 17 01:36 18 I 01:36 19

01:36

01:36

01:36

01:36

01:36

23 01:36 24 01:36

20

21

22

25

cigarette smoking, other -- multiple other chronic diseases. A history of depression, anxiety or other psychological disorder are all things that increase the risk before the physician ever lays pen to paper, and all of those things are laid out in the literature regarding the prescribing of controlled substances on a chronic basis. And the drug, there's also risk inherent in the drug.

So as we have said. Methadone is riskier than other opioids because of its unique pharmacology. And higher doses are riskier than lower doses, so those are things that we can know before the fact.

After-the-fact risk mitigation is in that realm that I called pharmacovigilance. Urine drug screening, pill counts, and later, the prescription drug monitoring program of the Pennsylvania -- of the Pennsylvania Department of Health. That was not applied -- that particular circumstance was not applied to my evaluation of Kristina Dame, because, in 2013 and 2014, physicians did not have direct access to The Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. Physicians did not gain direct access to The Prescription Drug Monitoring Program until late 2015, and it became a requirement, prior to writing a benzodiazepine or opioid prescription in January of 2017.

Even though a physician didn't have direct access to the Q. Prescription Drug Monitoring Program in 2014, was the drug monitoring program for Controlled II substances available in a

- 01:37 1 database in Pennsylvania in 2014?
- 01:37 2 A. It was.
- 01:37 3 Q. And does the fact that a physician can't access or could
- 01:37 4 not access the PDMP directly from his desk in 2014, does it
- 01:37 5 alter any of the previous guidelines or literature or policies
- 01:37 6 that you have talked about, in terms of a physician's
- 7 responsibility, when prescribing controlled substances?
- 01:37 8 A. No, it simply limits what we can reasonably presume that a
- 01:37 9 physician knew, as a matter of fact.
- 01:37 10 Q. So could a physician simply ask a patient, What drugs are
- 01:37 11 you taking?
- 01:37 12 A. That would be expected.
- 01:37 13 Q. What if a patient says, I'm not going to release my prior
- 01:37 14 medical records to you, before you treat me. Have you been
- 01:38 15 confronted with that, in your practice and experience? Is that
- 01:38 16 typical?
- 01:38 17 A. It would be exceedingly atypical, but it would be a red
- 01:38 18 flag on fire. If a patient is unwilling to provide you with the
- 01:38 19 information about their prior treatment, particularly, with
- 01:38 20 controlled substances, the only reason that I could imagine
- 01:38 21 that occurring is that there's something that the patient
- 01:38 22 doesn't want the physician to know.
- Physicians are knowledge workers. Ignorance is not bliss
- o1:38 24 in this profession. If one did not know, then, one would have
- 01:38 25 to act as if that lack of knowledge represents knowledge of the

- 01:38 1 worst case scenario. Because, otherwise, all of the risk is in
- 01:38 2 acting as if one knows. As my first teacher of medicine John
- 01:39 3 Thomas taught me, He who knows not and knows not that he knows
- 01:39 4 not is dangerous.
- 01:39 5 Q. And, in fact, one of the authorities that you have
- 01:39 6 testified to, being a part of the Pennsylvania Code 49 Section
- 01:39 7 1692, part of that prescribing and dispensing would be to
- 01:39 8 obtain prior medical records?
- 01:39 9 A. Yes, and that is, also, in the Federation of State Medical
- 01:39 10 Board's Model Policy.
- 01:39 11 Q. Now, in this case, you've testified that you had the
- 01:39 12 benefit of reading a report of an interview with Kristina
- 01:39 13 Dame's mother, that would be Margaret Dame; correct?
- 01:39 **14 A.** Yes.
- 01:39 15 Q. Was that, at all, informative to you, in reaching the
- 01:39 16 opinions and conclusions that you reached?
- 01:39 17 A. It was another data point that allowed me to understand
- 01:40 18 the circumstances in which the doctor was prescribing.
- 01:40 19 Q. Are you familiar with the term, differential diagnosis?
- 01:40 20 A. Yes.
- 01:40 21 Q. Can you please tell us what it means?
- 01:40 22 A. Differential diagnosis is the list that the physician
- 01:40 23 develops, when confronted with a patient. We rarely know
- 01:40 24 absolutely, from the first time we see a patient, precisely,
- 01:40 25 everything that is going on. The differential diagnosis is,

- 01 40
- 01:40
- 3 01:40
- 4 01:40
- 5 01:40
- 6 01:41

Yes.

7 Α. Yes. 01:41

Α.

- 9 01:41

01:41

01:41

01:41

- 13 01 - 41
- 141 01:41
- 01:41
- 16I 01:41
- 01:41
- 18 I 01:41
- 191 01:42
- 20 01:42
- 21 01:42
- 01:42
- 01 42
- 01:42

- 1 Here are the things that could be going on, given the 2 presentation of the patient that I have in front of me.
 - Is it a fairly typical tool that's used in medicine? Q.
 - Q. And can they -- a differential diagnosis also be used to
 - determine the cause of death?
- 8 Q. Or, let's say, the cause of an unintended death?
 - Α. Yes.
- 10 Q. Did you use a differential diagnosis in this case, in
- evaluating the records that were provided to you, in reaching 11 I 01:41
 - 12 an opinion regarding the cause of death in this case?
 - Α. Yes.
 - Q. Can you explain to us how you did that?
 - 15 Ms. Dame presented with a sudden -- with an unexpected Α.
 - death in a particular set of clinical circumstances. And just
 - as the coroner who performed the postmortem did not reach a 17 l
 - final diagnosis until after toxicology, it was the entirety of
 - the presentation that I used in determining the cause of death
 - with the but-for condition.
 - Ms. Dame had a history that was well-documented in the
- medical record of substance use, substance abuse and pain 22 01:42
 - complaints associated with that as a means of obtaining further 23
 - substances. And that was throughout the time that she was under 24
 - Dr. Evers' care. 25

01:42 1 01:42 2 01:43 3 01:43 4 01:43 5 01:43 6

7 01 - 43 01 - 43 9 01:43 10 01:43 11 01:43 12 01:43 13 01:43 141 01:43 15 01:44 16 01:44

17 01:44 18I 01:44 19 01:44 20 01:44 21 01:44 22 01:44 23 01:44 24 01 - 44

25

01:44

When she was found dead, the postmortem revealed no obvious cause of death, in terms of a hemorrhage or trauma or other internal organ dysfunction, but it did have an important physical finding, and that is, when the -- at the postmortem, there was frothiness in the mouth, and when he cut the lung, there was copious pulmonary edema fluid.

What that tells one is that, when the patient died, there was a lot of fluid in the lungs, and that is consistent with the deaths that occur when people become apneic, stop breathing, and, occasionally, try to breathe against a closed glottis, that is breathing in when your throat is closed off, because that produces negative pressure in the chest and pulls fluid into the lungs. It is a common thing to occur in anesthetics, in fact, or post-aesthetically, when patients are awakening, and you have to guard for it. But that's important information.

Then, when one obtains the toxicology, the toxicology showed that she had levels of drug in her blood, both a sedative hypnotic nordiazepam and Methadone, that were within the range that could produce both unconsciousness and closing of the airway, such as to provide a mechanism of death. She, incidentally, had a level of doxepin in her blood, as well, that would not have been directly contributory to her death, in the absence of the other drugs.

And thus, given the history, the postmortem examination

and the toxicology occurring in the setting of a patient who
was treated in the way that Mrs. Dame was, that is, a patient
who had been weaned off of opioid analgesics, between her last
prescription from Dr. Evers of Methadone in July and her
prescription of Methadone from Dr. Evers in September, she had
gotten progressively lower doses of Methadone, to the extent
that by the time he gave her her last prescription, she was,
essentially, free of the drug.

01 - 44

01:45

01:45

01:45

01:45

01:45

01 - 45

01 - 45

01:45

01:45

01:45

01:45

01:45

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:46

01:47

9

10

11

12

13

141

15

16I

17

18I

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in that circumstances, a patient with a history of substance abuse, a patient who had loss of control, secondary to multiple risk factors associated with her use of the drugs, who had been weaned to reinstate her tolerance to the drugs, who died in a manner that was determined by the coroner to not be from other causes, had a level of drug in her blood, particularly, Methadone and nordiazepam, an active metabolite of diazepam, the drug that is in Valium, which Dr. Evers had also prescribed, that those things, along with her postmortem examination and the manner of prescribing, led me to the conclusion that but for the prescription of Methadone, 360 10mg tablets, to a patient who was relatively opioid naive, given to her weaning over the course of two months, that Ms. Dame would not have died.

Q. You mentioned that -- you mentioned the diazepam and the Methadone that was in the toxicology. I just want to speak to you, generally, about -- can you speak to the risk or increased

01:47

01 - 47

01:47

01 - 47

3 01:47

4

9

10

17 l

18 I

5 01:47 6 l 01:47

7 01 - 47

01:47

01:47

11 01:47 12 01:47 13 01:48 141 01:48 **15** 01:48 16I 01:48

01:48

01:48

19 01:48 20 01:48 21 01:48 22 01:48 23 01:48

25 01:48

01 - 48

24

1 risk, when you have an opioid like Methadone and then you add a benzodiazepine, is there an increased risk, and if so, how much?

It is a problematic practicing of medicine that provides Α. opioids and benzodiazepines to patients, given that both the prescribing information for the opioid and the prescribing information for the benzodiazepine and the medical literature of the past 30 years, all state that these drugs are potentially hazardous when they are used together.

They are especially hazardous when they are used together in patients who do not exhibit adequate control of their medication-taking behavior. We know that because of their varied mechanisms, Methadone and the opioids acting in the lower portion of the brain where breathing occurs, while the benzodiazepines and other sedatives act in the higher part of the brain where consciousness occurs, that, by blocking one and then the other, you enhance their effects, particularly, if consciousness is lost, and the airway is no longer protected.

The degree to which they increase the risk is actually only measured after the fact, so we know that in 30 percent of the cases in which opioid overdose is known to be the cause of death, benzodiazepines occur. Because of their very mechanisms, they clearly enhance the risk of death or overdose or intoxication or any of the other harms that occur with the use of opioids, falls, accidents and other injuries.

01:49 1

01:49 3

01:49 4

01:49 5

01:49

01:49 7

9

01 - 49

01:49

01:49 10

01:49 11

01:49 12

01:49 13

01:49 14

01:50 15

01:50 16

01:50 17

01:50 18

01:50 19

01:50 20

01:50 21

01:50 22

01:50 23

01:50 24

01:50 25

But by itself, the co-administration of the benzodiazepine is risky, it may be negligent, but because it is widespread, it is not itself not for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice, unless it's demonstrated that it's problematic for the patient.

- Q. We talked about the but-for cause of death. In particular, in this case, based upon your training, your experience and consideration of the records that you reviewed, and in consideration of everything that you've testified to here today, were you able to reach an opinion regarding the cause of death of Kristina Dame?
- A. Yes, it was clear, and I agreed with the coroner, that it was mixed drug toxicity. It is called mixed drug toxicity because there was more than one drug involved. The primary drug being involved in her cause of death was Methadone, and that because of the mechanism of death and what the postmortem showed and a secondary cause was the presence of the nordiazepam.
- Q. Now, you've also talked a lot about the validity of the prescriptions and what a valid prescription is, in terms of the medical practitioner issuing it. Did you reach an opinion in this case about the whether or not the prescriptions that are identified in the indictment in this case were issued by the Defendant in the usual course of professional practice and for legitimate medical purposes?

- 01:50 1 A. Yes, I reached an opinion, and I believe they were not.
- 01:50 2 Q. Okay, and the opinion about the legitimacy of the
- 01:50 3 prescriptions, as well as the but-for cause of death, did you
- 01:51 4 include those opinions in your reports, which are identified as
- 01:51 5 Government's Exhibit Nos. 2 and 3? And if you could refer to
- 01:51 6 Exhibits Nos. 2 and 3, please.
- And just for purposes of the record, can you first
- 01:51 8 identify Government's Exhibit No. 2?
- 01:51 9 A. It is a report that I authored on August 12, 2019, United
- 01:51 10 States Department of Justice v. Martin Evers, M.D.
- 01:51 11 Q. And Government's Exhibit No. 3?
- 01:51 12 A. It is a report that I authored on September 7, 2020,
- 01:51 13 similarly labeled.
- 01:51 14 Q. The opinions that you have just testified to, have you
- 01:51 15 included those opinions in your reports?
- 01:51 16 A. Yes.
- 01:51 17 Q. Now, in terms of the but-for cause of death, can
- 01:51 18 you -- specifically talking about your background, your
- 01:51 19 training and your experience as an anesthesiologist -- does
- 01:52 20 that background and experience advance your opinions in this
- 01:52 21 case, especially, when you're asked to render an opinion as to
- 01:52 22 cause of death?
- 01:52 23 A. Yes.
- 01:52 24 Q. Can you explain to the Court how does that?
- 01:52 25 A. The drugs which we are discussing, opioids and sedative

01:52 3 01:52

4

7

10

13

15

01.52

01:52

01.52

01.53

01:53

01:53

01:53

01:53

01:54

5 01:52 01:52

9 01:53

11 01:53 12

01:53 141 01:53

16I 01:53 17 l

18I 01:53

19 01:53

21 01:54

20

22 01:54 23 01:54

24 01:54

25 01:54

hypnotics, are the cornerstone of anesthetic management. An anesthetic -- I'm sorry. My dad used to tease me that the reason I liked anesthesia was because I could dangle people over the chasm and then snatch them back.

An anesthetic is a controlled overdose. I have overdosed tens of thousands of patients deliberately and managed them after that occurred. I also, in treating patients, observed multiple overdoses. I've observed patients who have overdosed on Methadone in therapeutic concentrations. A patient, who I remember right now, who, when she was at 20 milligrams of Methadone twice a day, she was fine, at 30 milligrams, she stopped breathing.

My experience with these drugs is, frankly, at that region where patients overdose, where I've watched it happen repeatedly and managed them through it. So when I read what is happening here and I look at the blood levels and I look at the combinations, those are not dissimilar to my experience as an anesthesiologist, but, in fact, they are -- they have been part of my practice in outpatient medicine, in terms of minimizing those risks to my own patients.

It is certainly within the realm of all of my practice, over the course of the past 35 years that I draw from, and I base it upon the scientific principles of the practice of medicine that I've gleaned over that time.

Now, Dr. Thomas, are you aware of any change in the law Q.

01 - 54

2

- 01:54
- 3 01:54
- 41 01:54
- 5 01:54
- 6 01:55
- 7 01.55

01.55

01:55

01:55

9

11

- 10 01:55

- 12 01:55
- 13 01:55
- 14 01:55
- 15 l 01:55
- 16 01:55
- 17 l 01:55
- 18 I 01:55
- 19I 01:55
- 20 01:55
- 21 01:56
- 22 01:56
- 23 01:56
- 24 01:56
- 25 01:56

- 1 that occurred in 2018, 2019 or thereafter that prohibited physicians from prescribing opioids?
 - Α. None. The standards of practice -- frankly, the standards of practice in that period were relatively stable. There had been no particular changes since the introduction of the CDC guide of 2016.
 - Now, you mentioned the CDC, so I want to just refer your attention to one last exhibit, which is Government's Exhibit No. 9 in the binder. You talked about MME's, the Morphine Milligram Equivalents, and at one point, you were talking about a Morphine Milligram Equivalency of, I think you said, about 1100 or 1200 a day. Do you recall that?
 - Α. Um-hum.
 - Are there -- has the CDC issued recommendations for Q. Morphine Milligram Equivalents per day that are considered safe and advisories about exceeding the safe limits that you're familiar with?
 - The CDC Guideline states that the best dose is the lowest dose that the patient can tolerate that is consistent with analgesia and improved function for the shortest period of time. They identify several inflection points of risk.

Between 1 and 20 milligrams of Morphine equivalence is deemed the safest level of risk. There is an increased risk between 20 milligrams and 50 milligrams, but there's also evidence that, even in chronic non-cancer pain, there's a

01.56

2 01:56

01:56

4

5

9

01:56

01:56

01:56

6

7 01.56

01.56

01:56

10 01:57

11 I 01:57

12 01:57

13 01:57

14 01:57

15 l 01:57

16 01:57

17 l 01:57

18I 01:57

19 l 01:57

20 01:57

21 01:57

22 01:57

Α. I do.

23

24 01:57

01:57

25 01:57

modest increase in effectiveness in that range.

Up to 19 milligrams, there is another inflection point in risk, but there's, also, a lack of any evidence in the medical literature at greater than 19 milligrams of Morphine equivalence of an improvement in efficacy, in terms of an improvement in both pain intensity and function.

At 200 milligrams is the next inflection point, where we see -- 200 milligrams of Morphine equivalence -- where we see a clear inflection point, in terms of another increase in risk, with the risk of death increasing to more than 32 over the course of three to five years.

- Q. That would be at 200 Morphine milligram equivalencies and more?
- Α. Yes.
- Q. Even at more than 20 Morphine milligram equivalencies a day, there's a risk?
- Yes, the risk begins to increase for all harms associated with the drug, not just the risk of overdose and death, but the risk of falls, fractures, endocrinopathies, that is, suppression of the pituitary gland, and other harms associated
- with the drug.
- Can you take a look at Government Exhibit No. 9 and tell Q. us if you recognize that?
- And is this the directives or what you just testified to Q.

- 1 about the risks and the MME's of greater than 20 per day, does 01 - 57
- 2 this Exhibit No. 9 speak to that? 01:57

Yes.

Yes.

Why?

- Α. 3 01:57
- 01:57
- 4 Q. Did you rely on information such as this, provided by the
- 5 CDC, in reaching the opinions that you reached in this case? 01:58
- 6 01:58
- 01:58
- 7 Now, do those same MME's and that guidance apply to, let's Q.
- 8| say, someone who is dying of cancer and who is in hospice? 01.58
- 9 Α. No. 01:58

Α.

- 10 01:58

Q.

- The CDC in their guidelines of March 2019, specifically, 11 Α. 01:58
- 12 l state that it is applied to chronic non-cancer pain, which has 01:58
- 13 different mechanisms and underlying fundamentals than chronic 01:58
- 141 cancer pain. 01:58
- 15 01:58
- 16 01:58
- 17 01:58
- 18I 01:58
- 19 l 01:58
- 20 01:59
- 21 01:59
- 22 01:59

01:59

25 01:59

- Cancer pain, I always -- I describe as -- the difference
- between chronic non-cancer pain and cancer pain is, chronic
- non-cancer pain is a pebble in your shoe. Chronic cancer pain
- is someone with a knife cutting into your foot. The
- invasiveness, the metastases, the changing nature of the
- underlying tumor makes cancer pain exceedingly different, and
- frequently, the issue of duration of life makes a very big
 - difference because most people with back pain do not die of
- 23 back pain, while we may be dealing with end of life 01:59
 - circumstances in patients with cancer. 24
 - So there are very different, both morally,

philosophically, physiologically types of pain syndromes than 01 - 59 the problem of non-cancer pain that we're talking about when we 01:59 discuss these issues. And, in fact, when I review cases like 01:59 this, if I see a patient who has cancer pain who is included, I 41 will exclude them, because I would have to use a totally different set of paradigms, in order to evaluate that 01:59 prescribing. 7 8 Having said all of that, Dr. Thomas, in the opinions that

- you have expressed from the stand, as well as in your reports, can you tell us whether or not you hold those opinions to a reasonable degree of medical certainty?
- I hold each and every opinion that I have expressed within a reasonable degree of medical certainty.
- MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, at this time, I would move admission of Government's Exhibit Nos. 2 and 3, No. 2 being Dr. Thomas' April 12, 2019 report, No. 3 being Dr. Thomas' September 7, 2020 report.

THE COURT: Any objection to Government's 2 and 3? MR. BRIER: No objection, Your Honor.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, I would also move for admission of the authorities relied upon in Government's Exhibit 4, which is Title 28 Pennsylvania Code Chapter 25; Exhibit No. 5, which is 21 CFR 1306.04; Exhibit No. 6, which is Title 21 United States Code Section 829 defining Prescriptions; Exhibit No. 7, which is the Model Policy on Use of Opioid Analgesics and the

01:59

01:59

01:59

02:00

02:00

9

10 02:00

11 02:00

12l 02:00

13 02:00

14 02:00

15 02:00

16 02:00

17 l 02:00

18 02:00

19 02:00

20 02:00

21 02:00

22 02:01

23 02:01

24 02:01

25 02:01

```
1 Treatment of Chronic Pain; Exhibit No. 8, which is Title 49
02 · 01
         Pennsylvania Code Section 1692 defining Prescribing,
02:01
         Administering and Dispensing of Controlled Substances;
02:01
         Government's Exhibit No. 9, which is the CDC Opioid Guidance in
       4
02:01
         terms of MME's, which was just referenced by Dr. Thomas, and
02:01
         then Exhibit No. 10, I think that's already been admitted, that
02:01
         is the Methadone package insert.
       7 I
02 • 01
       8
               THE COURT: Mr. Brier, any objection to any of those
02 · 01
       9
         exhibits identified?
02:01
      10
               MR. BRIER: No objection, Your Honor.
02:01
               THE COURT: All right, Government's 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
      11
02:02
         and 10 are admitted.
      12
02:02
      13
               (At this time Government's Exhibit Nos. 2-9 were admitted
02:02
      14
                into evidence.)
02:02
      15
               MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, for purposes of the Daubert
02:02
         hearing, the Government has no further questions on direct for
      16
02:02
      17 l
         Dr. Thomas.
02:02
               THE COURT: Let's take 15 minutes and then we can continue.
      18
02:02
      19
               (At this time a recess was taken.)
02:02
      20
               THE COURT: Counsel, I understand there's an issue you'd
02:20
      21
         like to discuss with me before we proceed any further?
02:20
               MR. CASEY: Yes, Your Honor. I'd appreciate a few minutes.
      22
02:20
      23
               Procedurally, we have for the search warrant issue, both
02:20
         probable cause and Franks, we have witnesses coming from out of
      24
02:20
      25
         the area, about an hour out of the area, some of them are
02:20
```

disabled, some of them are people with families, and so we 02:20 would propose to the Court, instead of proceeding to the 02:20 3 probable cause section and having Diversion Investigator Derr 02:20 testify, we get to those who have come in to testify regarding 4 02:20 the Franks matter, and so they would follow the expert 5 02:20 testimony here, with one exception, there's one person on 02:20 standing that the Government wishes to call. 71 02:20

So, simply put, we're apprising the Court of what we would suggest the appropriate order to be for calling witnesses, and then secondarily -- or not secondarily -- but, also, the Assistant U.S. Attorney wanted to broach with the Court, I think, the relevancy issue or admissibility issue, with respect to some of the witnesses. I won't make her argument, Judge, I'll sit tight on that.

THE COURT: Am I to understand that you want to conduct this particular aspect of the other suppression motion before we return to Dr. Thomas?

MR. CASEY: No, Your Honor, this would follow Dr. Thomas.

THE COURT: All right, let's see where we are, after we conclude the Daubert hearing, and we can talk about these things, but I think it's a bit premature. We have a lot to do here, right now, and I'm reluctant to spend any more time on it. So with that, Mr. Brier, you can cross-examine.

MR. BRIER: Thank you, Your Honor. Frank Brier, on behalf of Dr. Martin Evers.

02:21 9
02:21 10
02:21 11
02:21 12
02:21 13

141

15

16I

17 I

19

20

02.20

02:21

02:21

02:21

02:21

02:21

02:21

8

02:21 18

02:21 **21**

02:21 22

02:21 23

02:22 24

02:22 25

02:22 1

CROSS EXAMINATION

- 02:22 2 BY MR. BRIER:
- 02:22 3 Q. Good afternoon, Doctor. How are you?
- 02:22 4 A. Good afternoon. How are you?
- 02:22 5 Q. Good, thanks. You've been up there a little while, and we
- 02:22 6 have just taken a short break, so we're going to go forward if
- 02:22 7 you're ready. Are you ready?
- 02:22 **8 A. Certainly.**
- 02:22 9 Q. Doctor, you went over with counsel for the Government your
- 02:22 10 curriculum vitae. Do you have a copy in front of you there?
- 02:22 11 A. I do.
- 02:22 12 Q. You testified on direct examination, Doctor, that that was
- 02:22 13 a current copy of your curriculum vitae; is that correct?
- 02:22 14 A. Yes.
- 02:22 15 Q. And you, during the course of your professional career,
- 02:22 16 from time to time, you update that and keep that as a complete
- 02:22 17 list of your professional activities; correct?
- 02:22 18 A. Yes.
- 02:22 19 Q. And, Doctor, in there, you indicate that you were a
- 02:22 20 resident in Anesthesiology and a Fellow in Pain Medicine and
- 02:22 21 Regional Anesthesiology. We covered that; correct?
- 02:22 22 A. That is correct.
- 02:22 23 Q. You mentioned on direct examination, during your
- 02:23 24 residency, that you were involved in Critical Care Medicine,
- 02:23 25 but you were not doing a residency in Critical Care Medicine;

- 02:23 1 correct?
- $_{02:23}$ 2 A. No, I was doing a residency in Anesthesiology, and part of
- 02:23 3 Anesthesiology, particularly, at Hopkins, is Critical Care
- 02:23 4 Medicine, because we are the department or were the Department
- 02:23 5 of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine.
- 02:23 6 Q. Correct. My question was, simply, it wasn't a residency in
- 02:23 7 Critical Care Medicine, you rotated through various
- 02:23 8 subspecialties as an anesthesiologist, during your residency;
- 02:23 9 correct?
- 02:23 10 A. Including Critical Care, yes.
- 02:23 11 Q. Including Labor and Delivery; correct?
- 02:23 12 A. Yes.
- 02:23 13 Q. Doctor, you testified on direct examination that from 2000
- 02:23 14 to the present, you're CEO and President of Pain and Disability
- 02:23 15 Management Consultants PC in Pittsburgh; correct?
- 02:23 16 A. Yes.
- 02:23 17 Q. Doctor, what percentage of your current practice is
- 02:23 18 medical/legal?
- 02:24 19 A. 90 to 95.
- 02:24 20 Q. 90 to 95 percent in court?
- 02:24 21 A. Actually, it would be 100 percent if you include the
- 02:24 22 Worker's Compensation and the patients I see for Worker's
- 02:24 23 Compensation and personal injury evaluations.
- 02:24 24 Q. For disability evaluations for Worker's Comp, you're not
- 02:24 25 treating those patients, you're just evaluating them; correct?

- 02:24 1 A. That is correct, I no longer have a current clinical
- 02:24 2 practice.
- 02:24 3 Q. You haven't had an active clinical practice of medicine
- 02:24 4 since June 30 of 2014; correct?
- 02:24 5 A. That is correct.
- 02:24 6 Q. So for the past seven years, you've been engaged 100
- 02:24 7 percent of your time in medical/legal reviews; is that correct?
- 02:24 8 A. Six and a half.
- 02:24 9 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to talk over you.
- 02:24 10 A. Six and a half, yes.
- 02:24 11 Q. Well, it be seven June 30th of this year; correct?
- 02:24 12 A. Correct.
- 02:24 13 Q. You testified on direct examination a number of times
- 02:24 14 about the presentations that you have done in court in
- 02:25 15 medical/legal analysis and expert opinions, and you testified
- 02:25 16 that on, at least, two occasions, you reviewed cases on behalf
- 02:25 17 of Defendants in criminal matters, but they did not call you as
- 02:25 18 a witness; correct?
- 02:25 19 A. Yes.
- 02:25 20 Q. So the only times that you have attended court to testify
- 02:25 21 in criminal matters, you've always been on behalf of the
- 02:25 22 prosecution; correct?
- 02:25 23 A. That is correct.
- 02:25 24 Q. In fact, you have three open current cases with the
- 02:25 25 prosecution, I think, in the Middle District; is that correct?

- 02:25 1 A. I can only think of two right now, but there are other
- 02:25 2 things that I read that are not ripe.
- 02:25 3 Q. And you testified earlier that you're a Certified
- 02:25 4 Independent Medical Examiner, and that Board that certifies
- 02:25 5 Independent Medical Examiners, that's really a certification
- 02:25 6 that you hold so that you can do these medical/legal IME
- 02:26 7 reviews; correct?
- 02:26 8 A. No, I could do them without it, I do it, in order to
- 02:26 9 demonstrate my competency in doing them.
- 02:26 10 Q. Fair enough. So you can still do them, even if you're not
- 02:26 11 Board certified in IME's, but you got that as an added
- 02:26 12 credential; correct?
- 02:26 13 A. Yes.
- 02:26 14 Q. But you're not a medical examiner in the sense that a
- 02:26 15 pathologist is a medical examiner?
- 02:26 16 A. I am not. I tried to make that plain.
- 02:26 17 Q. During the period of time before June 30 of 2014, when you
- 02:26 18 were, actually, clinically, treating patients, you were not in
- 02:26 19 a community-based primary care practice, correct, you were in
- 02:26 20 this pain specialty practice?
- 02:26 21 A. I've never been a primary care physician.
- 02:26 22 Q. You're not Board certified as a primary care physician;
- 02:26 **23 correct?**
- 02:26 **24 A. No.**
- 02:26 25 Q. You never had privileges as a primary care physician;

- 02:26 1 correct?
- 02:26 **2** A. No.
- 02:26 3 Q. That is correct, you have not?
- 02:27 4 A. That is, no, I have not.
- 02:27 5 Q. You never completed any residency in primary care?
- 02:27 6 A. I have not.
- 02:27 7 Q. You had mentioned on direct examination, Doctor, that you
- 02:27 8 have a Competency Certification in Controlled Substance
- 02:27 9 Management. Did I read that correctly?
- 02:27 10 A. That is correct.
- 02:27 11 Q. And that was in 2008; correct?
- 02:27 12 A. Yes.
- 02:27 13 Q. You've not re-certified or you've not re-established that
- 02:27 14 credential?
- 02:27 15 A. I have not. The drugs have not changed.
- 02:28 16 Q. Well, the practice has changed, you've talked about that
- 02:28 17 on multiple occasions today, since 1996, when they started
- 02:28 18 giving opioids for chronic pain, through 2011, when there was
- 02:28 19 this, as you said, cornerstone change -- I'm sorry -- 2011;
- 02:28 **20 correct?**
- 02:28 **21 A.** Yes.
- 02:28 22 Q. So the medications haven't changed, Doctor, but the way
- 02:28 23 the medications are used have changed; isn't that correct?
- 02:28 24 A. Yes, and I remain current with that.
- 02:28 25 Q. You're a member of the American Medical Association;

- 02:28 1 correct?
- 02:28 2 A. Among other institutions, yes.
- 02:28 3 Q. You're familiar with their model guidelines, and you would
- 02:28 4 not be giving expert testimony in an area or specialty on which
- 02:28 5 you have not had substantial practice; correct?
- 02:28 6 A. That is correct. And controlled substances is just that
- 02:28 7 area for me.
- 02:28 8 Q. Controlled substances; correct?
- 02:28 9 A. Yes.
- 02:28 10 Q. Not primary care?
- 02:28 11 A. I have not testified as the primary care, I've testified
- 02:28 12 as to the standard for any physician practicing in the United
- 02:29 13 States or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 02:29 14 Q. We understand, but from your review of the records, you
- 02:29 15 know that Dr. Marty Evers was a primary care community-based
- 02:29 16 physician; correct?
- 02:29 17 A. Yes. And the standards for primary care physicians in the
- 02:29 18 prescription of controlled substances is precisely the same as
- 02:29 19 it is for any physician in the prescription of controlled
- 02:29 20 substances.
- 02:29 21 Q. Doctor, you also gave us a list of your publications. You
- 02:29 22 have two publications, one is dated 2015 and one is dated 1988;
- 02:29 **23 correct?**
- 02:29 24 A. That is correct.
- 02:29 25 Q. So with the exception of those two publications, you have

- 1 no other publications on any of the subjects that we're talking
- 02:29 2 about today?
- 02:29 3 A. I have not published, no.
- 02:29 4 Q. So, for example, you have no peer-reviewed publications on
- 02:30 5 drug death investigations?
- 02:30 6 A. That is correct.
- 02:30 7 Q. You have no peer-reviewed publications on the manner of
- 02:30 8 death?
- 02:30 9 A. That is correct.
- 02:30 10 Q. You have no peer-reviewed publications, Doctor, on
- 02:30 11 opioid-related deaths; correct?
- 02:30 12 A. As you noted, I have two publications. They are listed.
- 02:30 13 Q. Well, we have talked about a lot on direct examination,
- 02:30 14 and these subjects came up, so I just want to ask you if you
- 02:30 15 have any peer-reviewed evidence-based publications anywhere
- 02:30 16 that I don't know about, on any of the subjects that we have
- 02:30 17 talked about, Doctor?
- 02:30 18 A. No.
- 02:30 19 Q. You do not have any publications on comprehensive death
- 02:30 20 investigations; correct?
- 02:30 **21 A. Correct.**
- 02:30 22 Q. You have no publications on opioid death with Long QT
- 02:30 23 Syndrome; correct?
- 02:30 **24 A.** Correct.
- 02:30 25 Q. That's a cardiology issue, isn't it, Long QT Syndrome?

- 02:30
- 02:30
- 3 02:30
- 4 02:31
- 5
- 02:31
- 7 02 - 31

- 9 02:31
- 10 02:31
- 11 02:31
- 02:31
- 02:31
- 14 02:31
- 02:31
- 16 02:31
- 17 I 02:31
- 18 I 02 - 31
- 02:31
- 20 02:31
- 21 02:31

- 02:31
- 23 02:31
- 24 02:31
- 25 02:31
- Α.

- It's a cardiology issue that, certainly, is one that Α.
- physicians prescribing Methadone must be aware.
- Q. Sure, but it's a cardiac issue, it's an arrhythmia;
- correct?
 - Α. If the prescriber is prescribing Methadone, they must be
- 6 aware of it. 02:31
 - Sure, and you mentioned that on your direct examination as Q.
- something to be aware of if you're prescribing Methadone. But 02 · 31
 - you have no publications on Sudden Death or Long QT Syndrome or
 - cardiac arrhythmias, related to Methadone administration;
 - correct?
 - No, I've simply observed it, and I'm passing on the 12
- information that I've read about it. 13
 - Doctor, you have no publications on volatile organic Q.
 - solvent inhalation, do you?
 - Α. No.
 - You read the pathology report in this case and you read
 - the medical records in this case, and you know that Kristina
 - 19 l Dame had a chronic problem with solvent inhalation; correct?
 - Yes. Α.
 - Q. It's mentioned in many places in her records and in the
 - police reports; correct? 22
 - That is correct. Α.
 - Q. It's also mentioned in the postmortem; correct?
 - Yes, it is.

- 02:31 1 Q. Doctor, in your practice, I'm sure, seven years ago, when
- 02:31 2 you were treating patients, you treated patients who, also,
- 02:32 3 were treating with anti-depressants; correct?
- 02:32 4 A. Yes.
- 02:32 5 Q. You also would see patients who were on antibiotics;
- 02:32 6 correct?
- 02:32 7 A. Yes.
- 02:32 8 Q. But your primary focus was the pain medication; correct?
- 02:32 9 A. No.
- 02:32 10 Q. You would have to incorporate those other things into the
- 02:32 11 treatment of the individual patient; correct?
- 02:32 12 A. Well, some of those, I would prescribe. For example,
- 02:32 13 anti-depressants are first line agents for neuropathic pain and
- 02:32 14 are anticonvulsants.
- 02:32 15 Q. What about antibiotics?
- 02:32 16 A. Antibiotics are not.
- 02:32 17 Q. So you wouldn't prescribe antibiotics?
- 02:32 18 A. I would prescribe antibiotics if it were necessary for a
- 02:32 19 condition with which the patient presented to me.
- 02:32 20 Q. But that wouldn't be a normal or standard part of your
- 02:32 21 practice in pain medicine, would it? You would refer the
- 02:32 22 patient back to their primary care physician; correct?
- 02:32 23 A. Well, actually, when I was performing implantations and
- 02:32 24 patients presented with wound infections, I would frequently
- 02:32 25 provide them with antibiotics or if a patient presented to me

- 02:32 1 and they had a need for antibiotic, I would begin the
- 02:33 2 prescription and then refer them to a primary care or to
- 02:33 3 another physician, but antibiotics are part of the practice of
- 02:33 4 medicine.
- 02:33 5 Q. Understood. Thank you for that clarification. I was
- 02:33 6 thinking -- I wasn't thinking of the interventional part of
- 02:33 7 your pain practice, where you do implants and injections;
- 02:33 **8 correct?**
- 02:33 9 A. That is correct.
- 02:33 10 Q. Doctor, have you ever done an autopsy?
- 02:33 11 A. Yes.
- 02:33 12 Q. You've done autopsies, yourself?
- 02:33 13 A. I have not done an autopsy since 1983, but yes, I've done
- 02:33 14 20 autopsies.
- 02:33 15 Q. So you did autopsies during your training?
- 02:33 16 A. Yes.
- 02:33 17 Q. But you never had privileges as a pathologist at a
- 02:33 18 hospital?
- 02:33 19 A. No.
- 02:33 20 Q. You were never in the Department of Pathology in a
- 02:33 **21 hospital?**
- 02:33 **22 A. No.**
- 02:33 23 Q. You never had privileges as a toxicologist in a hospital?
- 02:33 **24 A. No.**
- 02:33 25 Q. You never practiced as a toxicologist?

- 02:33 1 A. No.
- 02:33 2 Q. You never had a Fellowship or residency training as a
- 02:33 3 toxicologist?
- 02:33 4 A. That is correct.
- 02:33 5 Q. And, in fact, in this case, Doctor, you had to call the
- 02:33 6 toxicologist and ask him what he meant by the SA's. You put
- 02:34 7 that in your report, isn't that right?
- 02:34 8 A. I asked him for clarification, yes.
- 02:34 9 Q. Do you have notes from that conversation, Doctor?
- 02:34 10 A. I do not.
- 02:34 11 Q. So you called Dr. Coyer, in this case, and you asked him
- 02:34 12 what part of his report meant, but you didn't write any notes
- 02:34 13 down or provide us that in your report; correct?
- 02:34 14 A. That is correct. I put the evidence of it in my report, as
- 02:34 15 I mentioned.
- 02:34 16 Q. Did you ever call Dr. Ross and talk to him? He was the
- 02:34 17 forensic pathologist that did the autopsy.
- 02:34 18 A. I did not call the forensic pathologist that did the
- 02:34 19 autopsy.
- 02:34 20 Q. Are you familiar with term, autolysis, Doctor?
- 02:35 **21 A.** Yes.
- 02:35 22 Q. You have no publications on autolysis; correct?
- 02:35 **23 A. No.**
- 02:35 24 Q. Are you familiar, Doctor, with postmortem redistribution?
- 02:35 25 A. I am.

- 02:35 1 Q. You have no publications or lectures on postmortem
- 02:35 2 redistribution, do you?
- 02:35 3 A. I do not.
- 02:35 4 Q. Do you know, in this case, Doctor, from where they drew
- 02:35 5 the blood that was the subject of the exam?
- 02:35 6 A. I believe it's noted as femoral, but right now, I cannot
- 02:35 7 tell you, at this moment, without referring back to the
- 02:35 8 findings.
- 02:35 9 Q. We'll come back to that. You believe it was femoral?
- 02:35 10 A. At this moment, I do not know.
- 02:35 11 Q. So we'll come back to that. Do you know how long she was
- 02:35 12 dead, before they did the blood draw?
- 02:35 13 A. I noted it, but I cannot tell you from memory. And, in
- 02:35 14 fact, the precise time of death is not known, as she was
- 02:36 15 unattended.
- 02:36 16 Q. Right, so there was a time of death that was official that
- 02:36 17 was about 7 a.m., but the last time she had been seen alive was
- 02:36 18 about 9:00 the night before. Does that sound right to you?
- 02:36 19 A. That is correct.
- 02:36 20 Q. Between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. we don't know how long she was
- 02:36 21 dead in that period of time; correct?
- 02:36 22 A. That is correct.
- 02:36 23 Q. Doctor, are you familiar with lividity?
- 02:36 24 A. Yes.
- 02:36 25 Q. Did you notice or is anywhere mentioned in, either, the

- 02:36 1 State Police report or the postmortem report that the body had
- 02:36 2 lividity or rigor mortis?
- 02:36 3 A. Yes, it was mentioned she was in rigor and she had
- 02:36 4 posterior lividity.
- 02:36 5 Q. Lividity, meaning, that she had been sitting in that chair
- 02:36 6 long enough to form lividity on her backside; correct?
- 02:36 7 A. That was the report, yes.
- 02:36 8 Q. You said a minute ago, Doctor, that you did autopsies back
- 02:36 9 during your training. What percentage of your practice in
- 02:36 10 Pittsburgh was dedicated to performing postmortem examinations
- 02:37 11 or autopsies?
- 02:37 12 A. Zero, obviously.
- 02:37 13 Q. Doctor, what's evidence-based medicine?
- 02:37 14 A. Evidence-based medicine is the attempt to practice
- 02:37 15 medicine, in accordance with the best available evidence, based
- 02:37 16 upon a grading of that evidence from the randomized controlled
- 02:37 17 clinical trial to expert opinion and consensus.
- 02:37 18 Q. So if I understand you correctly -- and forgive me, I'm a
- 02:37 19 layperson -- you said, earlier, you translate into layperson.
- 02:37 20 Evidence-based medicine -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong
- 02:37 21 -- is the practice of medicine based on peer-reviewed studies
- 02:38 22 of clinical outcomes; correct?
- 02:38 23 A. No.
- 02:38 24 Q. What is it? You tell me.
- 02:38 25 A. It is the practice of medicine, based upon the best

- 02:38
- 02:38
- 02:38
- 02:38

41

- 5 02:38
- 02:38
- 71 02:38
- 81 02.38
- 02:38
- 10 02:38
- 02:38
- 02:38
- 02:38
- 141 02:38
- 02:38
- 02:39
- 17 l 02:39
- 18 I 02:39
- 19 l 02:39
- 02:39
- 21 02:39
- 22 02:39
- 23
- 02:39
- 02:39
- 02:39

- 1 available information, with a grading of that information from 2 randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trials to the least of that information, which is direct observation by

 - individuals.
 - So all of that is still evidence, we simply attempt to use the best evidence available for any given purpose to which we
 - need to apply it.
 - Okay, so and the evidence is deemed weak or strong,
- 9 depending on where that evidence is coming from; correct?
 - Α. Yes.
- And the clinical studies, especially, the double-blind 11I Q.
- random clinical studies, they're considered strong evidence,
 - correct, anecdotal evidence would be a little weaker; correct? 13 l
 - That is correct. Α.
 - 15 l Doctor, you testified on direct examination, very briefly, Q.
 - about a CDC Guidelines from 2016. But we can all agree we're 16
 - talking about 2014 in all of these questions; correct?
 - That is correct. Α.
 - Q. So, you know, even according to the AMA Guidelines, you
 - 20 should apply the standards that apply, at the time of the
 - event; correct?
 - That is what I said on direct. Α.
 - And the guidelines are guidelines, they're not -- I don't Q.
 - think the practice of medicine has evolved, yet, to the point 24
- where it's a recipe or cookie-cutter approach, where you just 251

- 02:39 1 look up the patient and it tells you what to do, correct,
- 02:39 2 there's still medical judgment involved?
- 02:39 3 A. That is what I said on direct.
- 02:39 4 Q. And, in fact, you said, when you review cases, you look at
- 02:39 5 the sources of law, and you look at the records and you apply
- 02:39 6 your judgment, training and experience to those sources;
- 02:39 7 correct?
- 02:39 8 A. I didn't understand the first thing you said. Sources of
- 02:39 9 1aw?
- 02:39 10 Q. Well, you talked about the CFR, the PA Code, you look at
- 02:40 11 those as part of your methodology, and then you look at the
- 02:40 12 records and you apply this judgment that you have to make an
- 02:40 13 opinion; correct?
- 02:40 14 A. Yes.
- 02:40 15 Q. So the guidelines are really structured for physicians to
- 02:40 16 understand what would be, I guess, a general application to the
- 02:40 17 clinical presentation, but we can't have guidelines that
- 02:40 18 anticipate every conceivable clinical scenario; correct?
- 02:40 19 A. No, guidelines do not anticipate every conceivable
- 02:40 20 scenario, however, they give us general direction for normative
- 02:40 21 physician behavior, relative to a particular area.
- 02:40 22 Q. Right, they give us general guidelines, right, and that's
- 02:40 23 what they're called?
- 02:40 24 A. Yes.
- 02:40 25 Q. Doctor, in this case -- and you went over it in your

- 02:41 1 direct examination -- you authored two reports; correct?
- 02:41 2 A. Yes.
- 02:41 3 Q. August 12 of 2019 and September 7, 2020; correct?
- 02:41 4 A. That is correct.
- 02:41 5 Q. And when you're doing those reports, Doctor, it's your
- 02:41 6 practice to be inclusive and comprehensive as you can with
- 02:41 7 those reports, as to inform the folks of the basis, the
- 02:41 8 methodology and foundation of your opinion; correct?
- 02:41 9 A. Yes.
- 02:41 10 Q. In fact, Doctor, you would agree with me you want to
- 02:41 11 review the records so you get the clearest possible picture of
- 02:42 12 the clinical scenario; correct?
- 02:42 13 A. I review the records that are available and always
- 02:42 14 conclude by saying that, if additional information becomes
- 02:42 15 available that would impact my opinion, I will respond to it.
- 02:42 16 Q. All right, but that wasn't exactly what my question was,
- 02:42 17 Doctor, and I apologize if I didn't ask it clearly.
- 02:42 18 My question was, you would prefer to have all of the
- 02:42 19 records, so that you get the clearest possible picture of the
- 02:42 20 events that you're opining about; correct?
- 02:42 21 A. I would prefer to know everything, and then I would know
- 02:42 22 everything. However, the limitations of any review are what's
- 02:42 23 available, at the time, and if any additional information would
- 02:42 24 change that, then, I would incorporate it, when provided.
- 02:42 25 Q. Doctor, again, I apologize if I'm not asking the question

02.42

02:42

02:43

1 clearly. I can ask it again.

2

4

02:43

5 02:43

02:43

7 I 02.43

02.43

9 02:43

10 02:43

11I 02:43

02:43

13 l 02:43

141 02:43

15 02:43

16 02:43

17 l 02:43

18I 02:43

19 02:43

20 02:43

21 02:43

22 02:44

23 02:44

24

02:44

25 02:44

You want to have as much of the records as you possibly can to have the foundation for your opinion; correct? You want to have all of the --

You're asking me about -- what you're asking me is what would I desire, and what I desire is irrelevant. What I had is what I had, what I responded to is what I was given. What I want is never part of the process.

Doctor, you were expressly critical of Dr. Evers for not availing himself of all of the records. Did you avail yourself of all of Doctor's records, before you opined on your first 12 report?

I availed myself of all the records that I had, and the difference between my criticism of Dr. Evers for not availing himself of the records is that I was not treating a live person in front of me.

Well, we'll get to that in a minute. But you got the records that were sent to you by the Government; correct?

That's what I had. Α.

Q. You didn't go out and find those records, yourself, you relied on the Government to provide you with the records that you reviewed, when you authored your first report; correct?

Α. Of course, I relied upon the Government, because I have no right to the records, other than the ones that they gave me.

Q. Right, so if you got an incomplete set of records from the

- 1 Government, that came from the Government, that's not your
- 02:44 2 doing; correct?
- 02:44 3 A. That is correct.
- 02:44 4 Q. When you do a peer-reviewed journal entry, as you have
- 02:44 5 done two, one of the things you would do, I would imagine, is
- 02:44 6 you would list all of the materials that you reviewed, so that
- 02:44 7 when the peer reviewers are looking at your process and your
- 02:44 8 outcomes, they know the specific foundations of the material
- 02:45 9 you reviewed; correct?
- 02:45 10 A. That's not correct.
- 02:45 11 Q. How would that not be correct, Doctor?
- 02:45 12 A. Well, one of the articles was peer-reviewed in
- 02:45 13 anesthesiology, the other was an editorial. So what one would
- 02:45 14 do is submit the paper along with bibliography, and the
- 02:45 15 bibliography would represent the information that was preceding
- 02:45 16 it and would be footnoted in the actual text of the article.
- 02:45 17 Q. Fair enough. So you have one peer-reviewed article in
- 02:45 18 anesthesia; correct?
- 02:45 19 A. Yes.
- 02:45 20 Q. In that article, I would imagine, you listed for the
- 02:45 21 reviewer the information, the sources of the information you
- 02:45 22 relied on in forming or writing your article; correct?
- 02:45 23 A. We wrote the abstract and gave them the bibliography that
- 02:45 24 was footnoted in the text.
- 02:45 25 Q. And you would do the same thing in authoring an expert

- 02:45 1 report, correct, you would try to convey, in fact, you do, you
- 02:45 2 say, records reviewed, in the first paragraph of your first
- 02:45 3 report, you list them up; correct?
- 02:46 4 A. I list the records reviewed, in order to state what I had
- 02:46 5 available, yes. I did not detail each and every record
- 02:46 6 reviewed, because that would make the report both unreadable
- 02:46 7 and 100 pages.
- 02:46 8 Q. Doctor, you listed some medical records. You listed that
- 9 you reviewed the coroner's report, autopsy and toxicology
- 02:46 10 report, medical records from the coroner, medical records from
- 02:46 11 Dr. Evers' office. Did I read that correctly?
- 02:46 12 A. Yes.
- 02:46 13 Q. You have the medical records from Dr. Evers's office, for
- 02:46 14 some reason, these are in the reverse order. March 6 of 2013 to
- 02:46 15 September 9 of 2014; correct?
- 02:46 16 A. That is correct.
- 02:46 17 Q. So you did, in that specific instance, list out exactly
- 02:46 18 what you reviewed; correct?
- 02:46 19 A. Right, but, for example, I grouped medical records from
- 02:47 20 Dr. Evers' office in a date range, but yes, that's what I
- 02:47 **21** reviewed.
- 02:47 22 Q. You, actually, gave us the dates of those office visits;
- 02:47 23 correct?
- 02:47 24 A. Yes. The inclusive range not the interval range.
- 02:47 25 Q. Understood. Doctor, when you treated patients in your

- 02 47
- 02:47
- 02:47
- 02:47
- 02:47
- 02:47
- 7 I 02:47
- 8 02 - 47
- 9 02:48

- 02:48
- 12 02:48
- 02:48
- 02:48
- 15 02:48
- 02:48
- 17 l 02:48
- 18I 02:48
- 02:48
- 20 02:48
- 21 02:48

02:48

- 23 02:48
- 02:48
- 25 02:48

- clinical practice, when you had an active clinical practice,
- prior to 2014, and you prescribed for them pain medication in a
 - variety of scenarios, I believe you talked about palliative
 - pain and cancer pain and chronic pain and acute pain and nerve 4
 - pain and somatic pain, all of those scenarios, when you did 5
 - that, all of your patients -- and this is going to sound like a
 - stupid question -- all of those patients were alive; correct?
 - Α. Until some of them died, yes.
 - Right, and you said, in fact, you made a joke about it, Q.
- 10 you were able to dangle them over the grave and pull them back; 02:48
 - correct? 11 I
 - There, I'm referring, specifically, to general anesthesia. Α.
 - 13 Specifically, to general anesthesia, in the OR, when you Q.
 - put somebody under; correct? 141
 - Yes, which represents part of my clinical experience with Α.
- drug overdose. 16
 - Q. When you talk about treating patients like that, I mean,
 - the point is, you bring them back and they're alive; correct?
 - 19 l What I'm getting at is that, in your active clinical practice
 - of medicine, it wasn't a normal part of your routine -- or
 - maybe you can correct me -- that you would deal with patients
 - who had passed away? 22
 - No, but in the course of providing anesthetics, I had Α.
- 24 three intraoperative deaths.
 - Q. I'm sorry to hear that. I'm not getting at that, but I'm

- 02:48 1 getting at the point is, Doctor, you answered earlier that you
- 02:48 2 don't do autopsies, you're not a pathologist?
- 02:49 3 A. That's correct.
- 02:49 4 Q. When you see patients, they're alive; correct?
- 02:49 5 A. Correct.
- 02:49 6 Q. I'm sorry, that's the way I should have asked it in the
- 02:49 7 first place. And when they're alive, they're metabolizing that
- 02:49 8 medication that you gave them oftentimes; correct?
- 02:49 9 A. That is correct.
- 02:49 10 Q. And when they're dead, there's a different process going
- 02:49 11 on; correct?
- 02:49 12 A. Yes, there are a number of things that occur, at the time
- 02:49 13 of death, that change the distribution of the compartments.
- 02:49 14 Q. Right, and it changes the distribution of the drugs that
- 02:49 15 are found on blood tests; correct?
- 02:49 16 A. That is correct.
- 02:49 17 Q. Time affects that, as well; correct?
- 02:49 18 A. That is correct.
- 02:49 19 Q. And the puncture point, where the blood is drawn from,
- 02:49 20 whether it's drawn from the superior vena cava or whether it's
- 02:49 21 drawn from the femoral source or whether it's drawn from a
- 02:49 22 popliteal source would have effect on what those values are;
- 02:49 **23 correct?**
- 02:49 24 A. It would have an effect upon the point estimate, yes.
- 02:49 25 Q. So it would be important to you, Doctor, as an

02:49

02:49

02:50

02:50 4

02:50 5

02:50

02:50 7

02:50

02:50

02:50 10

02:50 11

02:50 12

02:50 13

02:50 14

02:51 15

02:51 16

02:51 17

02:51 18

02:51 19

02:51 20

02:51 21

02:51 22

02:51 23

02:51 24

02:51 25

anesthesiologist or a pain medicine doctor who is reviewing a postmortem to know the point that the pathologist drew the blood from, correct, the anatomical point?

A. Not exactly, no. While it could make a difference, in terms of the point estimate, the issue of the number, that is, whether or not we're using the toxicology, because, as I pointed out, we don't use a toxicology as a separate determinant, we use it as part of the overall determination.

So the number, simply, in fact, given the clinical setting, need only be in the range of reported numbers for that particular drug, in order for it to be, more likely than not, that it is producing the effects that are seen, particularly, when we are doing that in the setting of a mixed drug intoxication like that of nordiazepam and Methadone.

- Q. Now, I'm not sure I understood all of that, Doctor. My question is, simply, would it make a difference in the value that's returned, for the blood value of the drug you're looking at, in this case, Methadone, depending on the source of the blood draw anatomically; correct?
- A. The blood draw, if we were to draw them separately or simultaneously from different sites may be different. However, for the purpose for which that number is being used, in terms of determining whether or not the patient had a toxic quantity of the drug in their blood, at the time death, that particular point estimate is precisely that.

1 02 - 51 02:51 3 02:51

4 02:51

02:51

5

02:52 71 02.52

02:52 9

02:52

02:52

11 02:52

10

141

12 02:52

13 02:52

02:52

15 02:52

16 02:52

17 l 02:52

18 02:52

19I 02:52

20 02:53

21 02:53

22 02:53

23 02:53

24 02:53

25 02:53

Do I believe that at every point in her body, at the time of death, that Kristina Dame had a Methadone concentration of 180 nanograms per milliliter? No. I'm sure that it was different at different points.

Do I believe that that particular number, 180 nanograms per milliliter, was the same at the moment that she ceased to respire, as it was at the time that the blood was drawn? No. Because that's not the way it works, because there are things that cause flux in the concentration.

But the real issue is, given that the reported concentrations in patients who have died from single-drug intoxication with Methadone is between 60 and 300 -- I'm sorry -- 3100, she is within the range. She, additionally, has the presence of nordiazepam. She, additionally, has no other indication of any other lethal event. She has that occurring in the setting of a patient who has her history and the prescribing that has occurred.

That is the manner by which I determined the but-for cause, not by, simply, the single number of 180 nanograms per milliliter.

- Q. Can you give us that reference range again for what could be toxic with Methadone?
- It has been reported between 60 nanograms per mill and Α. 3100.
- Q. And that depends, in part, on the drug tolerance of the

- 02:53 1 patient; correct?
- 02:53 2 A. It depends upon the clinical setting.
- 02:53 3 Q. You would agree with me, Doctor, that if the -- why don't
- 02:53 4 you explain to the Court, Doctor, if you can, what autolysis
- 02:53 **5** is.
- 02:53 6 A. Autolysis is the process by which cells break down through
- 02:53 7 enzymatic processes and release their contents into their
- 02:53 8 environment which equivalates with the blood compartment.
- 02:53 9 Q. So the blood is drawn after the patient has been dead for
- 02:53 10 God knows how many hours in this case, if the blood is drawn
- 02:53 11 from the superior vena cava, that could have -- return a higher
- 02:53 12 value, due to autolysis, than if it was drawn peripherally;
- 02:54 13 correct? Or should I defer to Dr. Ross?
- 02:54 14 A. There can be a higher level, from various aspects,
- 02:54 15 however, for the purpose of the determination of whether or not
- 02:54 16 she died from mixed drug intoxication, of which Methadone was a
- 02:54 17 substantive part, it makes no difference.
- 02:54 18 Q. Doctor, you would agree with me that patients who have a
- 02:54 19 blood value of 180 nanograms per milliliter can go about their
- 02:54 20 daily functions at that level, can't they, depending upon their
- 02:54 21 tolerance to the drug?
- 02:54 22 A. Yes, and, in fact, that value can be seen as a therapeutic
- 02:54 23 value in patients who have been gradually raised to it, but it
- 02:54 24 is certainly a toxic value in patients who have been rapidly
- 02:55 **25** raised to it.

- 02:55 1 Q. A very low value could be a toxic value to me, if I'm a
- 02:55 2 first-time user; correct?
- 02:55 3 A. I didn't hear the last part.
- 02:55 4 Q. A very low amount of Methadone could be toxic to anyone
- 02:55 5 who is a first-time user who is completely naive to the drug;
- 02:55 6 correct?
- 02:55 7 A. Right.
- 02:55 8 Q. But if someone is tolerant to the drug and they've been
- 02:55 9 having the drug over some time, in this case -- strike that. If
- 02:55 10 they've been having the drug over some time, they can develop a
- 02:55 11 tolerance to it, so they can have higher blood values of
- 02:55 12 Methadone and yet still function; correct?
- 02:55 13 A. Yes, and importantly, that does not apply to her.
- 02:55 14 Q. I'm sure you've seen that in your practice, Doctor, isn't
- 02:55 15 that true? You've seen people with higher Methadone levels go
- 02:55 16 about their daily function?
- 02:55 17 A. If the amount is raised gradually, that can occur.
- 02:55 18 However, deaths have been known to occur at relatively low
- 02:55 19 doses of Methadone, between 30 and 40 milligrams per day. In
- 02:55 20 fact, in Methadone maintenance institutions, the most common
- 02:55 21 time during which that overdose death will occur is at about 50
- 02:56 22 milligrams per day.
- 02:56 23 So it depends upon the direction and the magnitude of the
- 02:56 24 change. That vector is very important in making that
- 02:56 25 determination.

Q. And it's very broad? 02:56

02:56

02.56

02.56

02:56

02:56

02:56

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:57

02:58

02:58

02:58

7

9

10

17 l

19

20

21

22

- 2 Yes, and, therefore, must be interpreted in terms of the Α. 02:56 clinical history of the individual patient. 02:56
- Doctor, have you supplied us with any citations in your 4 Q. 02:56 report that would support what you're saying about that 180 5 02:56 nanograms per milligram being a fatal dose? 6

Do you have any peer-reviewed documents, peer-reviewed studies, evidence-based studies anywhere cited in your report that would support that assertion?

- Α. I did not cite it in my report.
- Well, the answer is, no, then, correct, Doctor? 11I Q. 02:56
 - 12 Α. I did not cite it in my report.
 - 13 Yet, you knew the purpose of this report was to inform us Q. and to inform the Court what you were doing here, correct, and 141 15 you failed to cite the specific -- you say you have one -- the specific peer-reviewed, evidence-based study that's going to 16 tell us that if Dr. Evers gives a patient 180 milligrams, what amounts to 180 nanograms per milligram of Methadone, that 18I patient is going to die?
 - Not that the patient is going to die, but the patient is at risk for death, and it's in her medical record, it's in her autopsy in the Toxicology section.
 - 23 While we're talking about toxicology, Doctor, it just Q. gives a value not a range to give the 180 nanograms, as you 24 said, per millimeter; correct? 25 l

- 02:58 1 A. It does give a range for the values which have been
- 02:58 2 observed at death.
- 02:58 3 Q. So that's 60 to 3100; correct?
- 02:58 4 A. Yes.
- 02:58 5 Q. Blood Methadone concentrations average 280 nanograms per
- 02:58 6 milliliter in 59 victims of fatal Methadone overdose.
- 02:58 7 A. Average is a central tendency.
- 02:58 8 Q. So average is 260 nanograms per milliliter; correct?
- 02:58 9 That's in the toxicology report.
- 02:58 10 A. Yes, and that's also single drug, not mixed. Continue.
- 02:59 11 Thank you.
- 02:59 12 Q. Doctor, you'd also notice that, on her urine screen, there
- 02:59 13 was fentanyl; correct?
- 02:59 14 A. Yes.
- 02:59 15 Q. When you talked to Dr. Coyer who is the toxicologist who
- 02:59 16 actually did this study, and you talked to him on the telephone
- 02:59 17 and asked him about the study -- and, Doctor, this should be in
- 02:59 18 front of you. Do you have the toxicology report and postmortem?
- 02:59 19 A. I do not.
- 02:59 20 Q. There should be a binder up there, Doctor. It's Page 0057.
- 02:59 21 A. There is no binder here. Okay, yes.
- 03:00 22 Q. Doctor, are you there on the toxicology report dated
- 03:00 23 12/8/14 signed by Dr. Coyer?
- 03:00 24 A. 12/25/14.
- 03:00 **25 Q. 9/25/14.**

- 03:00 1 A. I'm sorry, 9/25/14.
- 03:00 2 Q. That's correct. The signature date at the bottom, Doctor,
- 03:00 3 is 12/8/14.
- 03:00 4 A. Okay, yes.
- 03:01 5 Q. On Page 4 of your report, Doctor, you state -- I'll read
- 03:01 6 it to you if you have a copy there.
- 03:01 7 A. I have it.
- 03:01 8 Q. "While the toxicology report stated that multiple over 400
- 03:01 9 drugs were screened, the precise findings were not clear.
- 03:01 10 Given the absence of a list of negative findings, I contacted
- 03:01 11 the testing laboratory for procedural verification."
- 03:01 12 Did I read that correctly?
- 03:01 13 A. Yes.
- 03:01 14 Q. I think, when we're talking about this, there is the
- 03:01 15 footnote at bottom of Dr. Coyer's toxicology report, where it
- 03:01 16 says, "The resulting data", and on the third line down, "is
- 03:01 17 compared to an extensive spectral library of over 400 of the
- 03:01 18 most commonly found illicit and prescription drugs."
- 03:01 19 Did I read that correctly?
- 03:01 20 A. That's correct.
- 03:01 21 Q. So what did Dr. Coyer tell you that meant?
- 03:01 22 A. That all the things that were not reported were negative.
- 03:02 23 Q. I'm sorry, say that again.
- 03:02 24 A. Everything that was not reported as positive was negative.
- 03:02 25 Q. But only as opposed to what's been tested against that

- 03:02 1 library of 400 chemicals; correct?
- 03:02 2 A. Yes.
- 03:02 3 Q. So did Dr. Coyer tell you, for example, that if there was
- 03:02 4 fentanyl in her system that was not in that spectral library,
- 03:02 5 it wouldn't show up on that test; correct?
- 03:02 6 A. That was -- that's a common drug of abuse that would have
- 03:02 7 been tested, which was why it was tested in her urine.
- 03:02 8 Q. It showed up in her urine from the fentanyl from the
- 9 patch; correct?
- 03:02 10 A. Presumably.
- 03:02 11 Q. There was no patch on her body, according to the
- 03:02 12 postmortem; correct?
- 03:02 13 A. Some.
- 03:02 14 Q. But she had -- she didn't have a patch on her body, but
- 03:02 15 she had fentanyl in her urine; correct?
- 03:02 16 A. I would have to look at the --
- 03:02 17 THE COURT: Just a moment, sir.
- 03:03 18 MS. OLSHEFSKI: I'm going to object, at this point, only
- 03:03 19 because this is a Daubert hearing, and we're supposed to be
- 03:03 20 challenging the qualifications, the methodology, the
- 03:03 21 reliability, and the fit of expert testimony in this case. This
- 03:03 22 is not the trial, and to attack the substance and the
- 03:03 23 credibility of opinions in this way is not appropriate for a
- 03:03 24 Daubert hearing.
- 03:03 25 MR. BRIER: Your Honor, under Rule 702, I'm allowed to

1 check his methodology and the foundations for the information 03.03 2 that he provided. And he's authored two expert reports, the 03:03 Government went through the basis and foundation, as they saw 03:03 it, and I'm allowed to challenge it. Specifically, under 702, 4 03:03 Your Honor, I'm allowed to challenge the quality -- I'm sorry 03:03 -- the expert's scientific, technical and other specialized 6 03:03 knowledge that will help the trier of fact understand the 7 03.03 evidence, including the information that is the reliable 03:03 foundation, whether there's a reliable foundation for the 9 03:04 10 report. 03:04 11 03:04

So my question gets to, Doctor --

THE COURT: Just a moment. I didn't rule on anything.

MR. BRIER: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I meant to say -- my question was to Your Honor, and I said, Doctor, out of force of habit.

THE COURT: I'm going to give you some leeway, but Ms. Olshefski is correct, you're not trying this case to me. Surely, you all understand that.

MR. BRIER: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You can certainly inquire into his methodology, and you can certainly inquire into what facts were in his possession upon which he based his opinion or opinions, but I am not going to allow this to be turned into a mini-trial on his ultimate believability before the jury.

So be guided by that. And if you think that's happening,

20 03:04 21 03:04 22 03:04

12

13

141

15

16

17 l

18I

19

03:04

03:04

03:04

03:04

03:04

03:04

03:04

03:04

23 03:04 24 03.04

25 03:04

- 03:04 1 Ms. Olshefski, you object. Let's go.
- 03:05 2 MR. BRIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 03:05 3 BY MR. BRIER:
- 03:05 4 Q. Doctor, in the report that you authored, you indicated
- 03:05 5 that -- I'll move on, Your Honor.
- You indicated that, on the second page, Doctor, first full
- o3:05 7 paragraph, it says;
- 03:05 8 "The earliest documentation that I have available,
- 03:05 9 regarding Dr. Martin Evers, an internist, care of Ms. Dame was
- 03:05 10 dated March 20, 2013." Did I read that correctly?
- 03:05 11 A. Yes.
- 03:05 12 Q. Doctor, are you aware of any documentation of office
- 03:05 13 visits prior to March 20 of 2013?
- 03:06 14 A. That was the first office note. There were papers in her
- 03:06 15 file as early as March 6, 2013.
- 03:06 16 Q. So that was the first office visit she had with Dr. Evers,
- 03:06 17 according to your review of the records, Doctor, was March 20,
- 03:06 18 2013; correct?
- 03:06 19 A. Yes, there were some other contact with his office as
- 03:06 20 early as March 6, 2013.
- 03:06 21 Q. And, then, Doctor, a year later, in September 2020, you
- 03:06 22 authored a supplemental report, and you indicated that you had
- 03:06 23 reviewed additional documentation; correct?
- 03:06 24 A. Yes.
- 03:06 25 Q. Doctor, turn to the binder in front of you, if you would,

- 03:07 1 to Page 64568.
- 03:07 2 A. Yes.
- 03:07 3 Q. Do you want to identify that for the record, please?
- 03:07 4 A. This appears to be an office note from Dr. -- it's an
- 03:07 5 office note, I don't know who it's from, because there is no
- 03:08 6 signature, but it's dated 10/11/2012, and it says she comes in
- 03:08 7 to establish care.
- 03:08 8 Q. That says, "Kristina came in to establish care. Her
- 03:08 9 medical issues include chronic back pain." Correct?
- 03:08 10 A. Yes. Did you want me to read it?
- 03:08 11 Q. No, I'm going to ask you, did Dr. Evers take a subjective
- 03:08 12 history from the patient?
- 03:08 13 A. Did Dr. Evers do this? I don't see his signature.
- 03:08 14 Q. I can get you a page that has the signature line on it.
- 03:08 15 A. Okay.
- 03:08 16 Q. 64506.
- 03:09 17 A. Okay, yes, this appears to be from Dr. Evers, yes.
- 03:09 18 Q. Office note from Dr. Evers for Kristina Dame; correct?
- 03:09 19 A. Yes.
- 03:09 20 Q. You were not provided that for your initial review;
- 03:09 **21 | correct?**
- 03:09 22 A. No, I've never seen it before.
- 03:09 23 Q. Did Dr. Evers do an assessment of the patient?
- 03:10 24 A. There is a brief assessment, yes.
- 03:10 25 Q. Did he review old hospital available data, going back to

- 03:10 1 2012, including imaging and labs?
- 03:10 2 A. Actually, it appears that he reviewed hospitalizations
- 03:10 3 going back to 2009 for detoxification from opioids and
- 03:10 4 benzodiazepines and labs, yes.
- 03:10 5 Q. Doctor, turn the page to 64567. Can you identify that for
- 03:10 6 the record, please?
- 03:10 7 A. This is an office note from Dr. Evers, date of service
- 03:11 8 November 8, 2012.
- 03:11 9 Q. Was that provided to you by the Government for your
- 03:11 10 review?
- 03:11 11 A. No, I have not seen this before.
- 03:11 12 Q. That's a SOAP note, correct, that's what doctors call
- 03:11 13 them, Subjective Objective Assessment and Plan; correct?
- 03:11 14 A. Yes.
- 03:11 15 Q. He takes her vital signs, notes her medications; correct?
- 03:11 16 A. Yes.
- 03:11 17 Q. You'll note she was on Morphine and Valium, at that time;
- 03:11 18 correct?
- 03:11 19 A. Yes.
- 03:11 20 Q. She was also receiving MS Contin and Lyrica and Santyl,
- 03:11 21 which is a topical cream for a skin lesion; correct?
- 03:11 22 A. MS Contin is Morphine, and Morphine, Lyrica, Valium.
- 03:11 23 Q. I'm sorry, the Morphine is listed there, correct, I read
- 03:11 **24** that.
- 03:11 25 A. Yes, and MS Contin is Morphine, so she was receiving high

- 03:11 1 dose Morphine --
- 03:12 2 Q. And Valium and Lyrica?
- 03:12 3 A. Valium and Lyrica, yes.
- 03:12 4 Q. Doctor, turn the page to 64566. Can you identify that for
- 03:12 5 the record?
- 03:12 6 A. This is an office note from 12/4/2012.
- 03:12 7 Q. Was that provided to you by the Government for your expert
- 03:12 8 review?
- 03:12 9 A. I have not seen this before.
- 03:12 10 Q. That's a SOAP note for Kristina Dame in Dr. Evers' office;
- 03:12 11 correct?
- 03:12 12 A. Yes.
- 03:12 13 Q. Doctor, turn the page. 64565. Identify that for the
- 03:12 14 record, please.
- 03:12 15 A. It's another progress note from 24 days later.
- 03:12 16 Q. That's a SOAP note; correct?
- 03:12 17 A. Yes.
- 03:12 18 Q. Six lines down in the first paragraph, you can read along
- 03:13 19 with me;
- 03:13 20 "Pain medication is now adequate, but she is not sleeping
- 03:13 21 well."
- 03:13 22 Is that an assessment of the effectiveness of the pain
- 03:13 23 medication she was receiving at that point?
- 03:13 24 A. Yes.
- 03:13 25 Q. Doctor, turn the page to 64564. Could you identify that

- o3:13 1 for the record, please?
- 03:13 2 A. Another progress note from date of service January 15,
- 03:13 3 2013.
- 03:13 4 Q. And that's for Kristina Dame from Dr. Evers?
- 03:13 5 A. That is correct.
- 03:13 6 Q. Was that provided to you by the Government for your expert
- 03:13 7 review?
- 03:13 8 A. I have not seen it before.
- 03:13 9 Q. It documents that she was in the Emergency Department;
- 03:13 10 correct?
- 03:13 11 A. I didn't understand the question.
- 03:13 12 Q. I'm sorry. Third paragraph down, Doctor. It documents that
- 03:13 13 Dr. Evers said she was in the Emergency Department because of
- 03:14 14 excessive urination and inconsistent urination; correct?
- 03:14 15 A. Yes.
- 03:14 16 Q. And he notes there what her labs are; correct?
- 03:14 17 A. Yes.
- 03:14 18 Q. Doctor, turn the page to 64563. Can you identify it for
- 03:14 19 the record, please?
- 03:14 20 A. January 22, 2013. It is a progress note that details that,
- 03:14 21 "Her pain medications are allegedly adequate. She's on high
- 03:14 22 dose oxycodone, Valium, Lyrica, Santyl and trazodone. She has
- 03:14 23 had two falls injuring her left ankle."
- 03:14 24 Q. That's a SOAP note for Kristina Dame in Dr. Evers' office
- 03:14 25 one week after the last visit; correct?

- 03:15 1 A. That is correct.
- 03:15 2 Q. Was that provided to you by the Government?
- 03:15 3 A. I have not seen it before. As I stated, the first progress
- 03:15 4 note I had was 3/20.
- 03:15 5 Q. Doctor, turn the page. Page 64562.
- 03:15 6 A. Yes, another progress note dated February 19, 2013.
- 03:15 7 Q. So this is three weeks later, she's in his office again;
- 03:15 8 correct?
- 03:15 9 A. Yes.
- 03:15 10 Q. She has a psoriatic lesion and he orders Prednisone, a
- 03:15 11 steroid; correct?
- 03:15 12 A. That is correct.
- 03:15 13 Q. He palpates her abdomen for tenderness and he notes she
- 03:15 14 has a lesion along her C-section scar on her abdomen; correct?
- 03:15 15 A. That is correct.
- 03:15 16 Q. Did you have that note, Doctor, before you opined your
- 03:15 17 expert opinion about Dr. Evers' treatment of Kristina Dame?
- 03:15 18 A. I did not.
- 03:16 19 Q. Going back to the first note of October 11, 2012, it notes
- 03:16 20 in there at the bottom, Doctor, last paragraph. It says;
- "She has an MRI that shows she has a cyst, a syrinx."
- 03:16 22 Could you explain what a syrinx is?
- 03:16 23 A. A syrinx is a collection of cerebral spinal fluid that
- 03:16 24 occurs in the central canal of the spinal cord. Cerebral spinal
- 03:16 25 fluid bathes the spinal cord and is generated inside the

- 03.17
- 03:17
- 03:17
- 03:17
- 03:17
- 03:17
- 71 03:17
- 8 03.17
- 03:17
- 11 03:17
- 03:17
- 03:17
- 141 03:17
- 15 03:17
- 03:17
- 17 03:18
- 18 I 03:18
- 19 03:18
- 21 03:18

03:18

- 03:18
- 23 03:18
- 25 03:19

- 1 ventricles or spaces of the brain. The central canal of the
- 2 spinal cord is normally very small. If there's a blockage to
- the outflow of cerebral spinal fluid which flows through it and
- through areas that dump the cerebral spinal fluid into the 4
 - veins, the pressure builds up, and you get a collection of
 - spinal fluid called a syrinx that compresses the nerves
 - surrounding it.
 - And that's an objective imaging finding that would support
- that she has a lesion in her spinal cord, correct, or, at 03:17
 - 10 least, adjacent to her spinal cord?
 - Yes, I noted that she had a diagnosis of syringomyelia. Α.
 - 12 Doctor, if you go back up to the first paragraph under, Q.
 - Available Old Data, last paragraph -- I'm sorry, last sentence. 13
 - It says;
 - "Urine drug screen with benzodiazepines, opioids,
 - 16 tricyclics, pregnancy test negative."
 - You'd agree with me, Doctor, that's documentation in
 - Dr. Evers' chart of a urinalysis report?
 - Α. That is a documentation that someone else did a urine drug
 - 20 screen, yes.
 - Q. Yes, and he put that in his review, in the first visit the
 - patient was in his office; correct? 22
 - Α. That is correct. In fact, that was noted in my report that
- other physicians have performed urine drug screens. 24 03:18
 - Q. Doctor, you had testified earlier about the Morphine

- 1 equivalency of Methadone; correct?
- 03:19 2 A. I did.
- 03:19 3 Q. And you gave us the chart that was in the CDC Guidelines;
- 03:19 4 correct?
- 03:19 5 A. Yes.
- 03:19 6 Q. I believe that the Government moved that exhibit into
- 03:19 7 evidence.
- 03:19 8 Methadone -- on Government Exhibit 9, Page 2 -- they give
- 03:19 9 a range from 1 to 80 milligrams a day for their Morphine
- 03:19 10 equivalency conversion factors; correct?
- 03:19 11 A. That's from 1 to 80 milligrams of Morphine equivalence per
- 03:19 12 day at 1 to 20 milligrams of Methadone.
- 03:19 13 Q. Right below that, it says;
- "Dose conversions are estimates and cannot account for all
- 03:20 15 individual differences in genetics and pharmokinetics."
- 03:20 16 Correct?
- 03:20 17 A. Absolutely.
- 03:20 18 Q. Doctor, do you recall testifying in the Dr. Li case?
- 03:20 19 A. Dr. who?
- 03:20 **20 Q. Dr. Li.**
- 03:20 **21 A.** Yes.
- 03:20 22 Q. You testified the way you're testifying today, you were
- 03:20 23 under oath and in the courtroom; correct?
- 03:20 24 A. Yes.
- 03:20 25 Q. In fact, I believe it was Judge Mariani; correct?

- 03:20 1 A. No, it was not, it was Judge Caputo.
- 03:20 2 Q. My mistake. In that case -- and I could show you if you
- 03:20 3 want to see it -- you said the Methadone multiplier for a
- 03:20 4 conversion is 4.5.
- 03:20 5 A. Yes.
- 03:20 6 Q. And that it builds up in the body. Do you stand by that?
- 03:20 7 A. At lower doses, that's the straight line conversion. It
- 03:21 8 does not take into account higher doses of Methadone, that's
- 03:21 9 correct.
- 03:21 10 Q. And it doesn't take into account the variability with
- 03:21 11 different patients; correct?
- 03:21 12 A. It does not, it is an estimate.
- 03:21 13 Q. Doctor, your initial report dated August of 2019, you had
- 03:22 14 testified -- I'm sorry -- you wrote that Ms. Dame was opioid
- 03:22 15 naive; correct?
- 03:22 16 A. That is correct.
- 03:22 17 Q. And then, after reviewing more of her records, you amended
- 03:22 18 that to say she was relatively opioid naive; correct?
- 03:22 19 A. That's true.
- 03:22 20 Q. Could you explain to me, Doctor, where you got the term,
- 03:22 21 relatively opioid naive?
- 03:22 22 A. From English. Ms. Dame had been opioid tolerant during the
- 03:22 23 period of continuous prescription of Methadone, as much as 160
- 03:22 24 milligrams per day, from Dr. Evers. After Ms. Dame left
- 03:22 25 Dr. Evers' care in early July of 2014 and went to First

03:23 1 03:23 2 03:23 3 03:23 4 03:23 5

03:23 **7**03:24 **8**03:24 **9**

03:23

03:24

03:24

6

10

13

19

24

03:24 **11** 03:24 **12**

03:24 14 03:24 15 03:25 16 03:25 17 03:25 18

03:25 20 03:25 21 03:25 22 03:25 23

03:25

03:25 25

03:25

Hospital, she was weaned from the -- from Methadone, initially, and in that time, from July 1 through January -- I'm sorry -- September 3, she obtained three prescriptions from physicians who were not Dr. Evers. One for 84 tablets, one for 36 tablets, and the last for seven tablets.

The prescription she obtained for seven tablets was written on -- one moment please -- was written a week prior to the prescription she got from Dr. Evers, and, in fact, she was administered five milligrams of Methadone at Horsham Clinic as her last dose prior to the prescription that she got from Dr. Evers, and that was, at least, four days prior to his seeing her.

That means that she had been without Methadone for four days, after having been weaned from 150 milligrams down to 5 milligrams. If we take into account that last seven tablet, 70 milligrams, over the course of the last 10 days, then, she would have been getting, roughly, in the last week, about 8 milligrams of Methadone per day, if we average it over that period, not including any periods of complete abstinence.

Relative to her Methadone tolerance at 160 milligrams, she was relatively opioid naive. She had been weaned over a prolonged period, and one would expect that, physiologically, her opioid tolerance would be quite low. That's what I mean by relatively.

Q. Well, isn't the half life of Methadone variable, as well,

- 03.25
- 03:25
- 3 03:25
- 41 03:25

03:26

5

- 6 03:26
- 71 03:26
- 8 03:26
- 9 03:26
- 10 03:26
- 11I 03:26

- 03:26
- 03:26
- 03:26
- 19 03:26
- 20 03:27
- 21 03:27
- 03:27
- 03:27
- 03:27

- 1 in terms of with the conversion on the Morphine units is
- 2 variable, depending on the patient?
 - Α. It is.
 - So what you said, her last dose of Methadone was just four Q.
 - days before --
 - MS. OLSHEFSKI: Objection, Your Honor. I think we're
 - getting into an area of testing the credibility of Dr. Thomas'
 - opinions.
 - THE COURT: Sustained.
 - BY MR. BRIER:
 - Doctor, it would be important to your analysis when her Q.
- last dose of opioids was; correct? 12 03:26
- 13 It would be -- I'm not sure I would say it was important, 03:26
- it is a particular data point. I think, because we are talking 141 03:26
- 15 about orders of magnitude, the precise moment of her last dose 03:26
- is not. 16I
 - Do you have any peer-reviewed or any evidence-based 17 l
- documentation that you can cite to that tells us, specifically, 18I
 - what the half life is of Methadone in these circumstances?
 - In Ms. Dame? Α.
 - Q. Yes.
 - The half life of Methadone is always referred to in a 22 Α.
- range, with the longest half life being, that's reported in the 23 03:27
- 24 literature, being about 56 hours, with the shortest half life
- in some patients who are so-called rapid accelerators being as 25

03.27

03:27

4

5

31 03:27

03:27

03:27

03:27

7 03.27

03.27

9 03:27

03:28

11I 03:28

03:28

13 03:28

141 03:28

15 03.28

16 correct? 03:28

03:28

18 I 03:28

19 A. 03:28

20 03:28

21 03:28

22 03:28

03:28

Kristina Dame? 24 03.28

03:28

25

23

It's 8,000 pages. I think that there was, but I cannot

1 short as eight hours. Beyond that, I do not know. The general 2 observable half life in most patients tends to be in the range of 24 hours.

However, because we are talking about orders of magnitude difference in dosing, that is not an appreciably important fact, in terms of my overall analysis.

Doctor, when you reviewed the Pennsylvania State Police Q. report to form your opinion, when you reviewed the coroner's report to form your opinion, when you reviewed Dr. Evers' 10 records, you reviewed the photographs we heard about on direct examination, where did you learn, Doctor, that the Methadone 12 that was in Kristina Dame's system, on autopsy, was the

From the prescribing. Α.

Q. There was a prescription bottle in the photograph;

17 l Α. I believe so, yes.

> How many pills were out of it? Q.

> Methadone that came from Dr. Evers?

I can't tell you.

Q. Can you tell me whether it was relatively full?

Α. At this moment, I cannot tell you.

Did you see any Pennsylvania State Police inventory where Q.

a pill count was done on the bottle that was found with

- 03:29 1 tell you that for a fact at this very moment.
- 03:29 2 Q. You think there was a pill count, but you don't recall?
- 03:29 3 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Objection, Your Honor.
- 03:29 4 THE WITNESS: I'm unsure.
- 03:29 5 THE COURT: Just a moment. When an objection is raised,
- 03:29 6 stop, please.
- 03:29 7 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, sir.
- 03:29 8 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Same reason, Your Honor. He's attacking the
- 03:29 9 credibility of Dr. Thomas, and that's not the purpose of this
- 03:29 10 hearing. I'm sorry, he's attacking the credibility of the
- 03:29 11 opinion of Dr. Thomas.
- 03:29 12 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 03:29 13 BY MR. BRIER:
- 03:29 14 Q. Doctor, you testified at length, on direct examination,
- 03:29 15 about the but-for causation of the death of Kristina Dame;
- 03:29 16 correct?
- 03:29 17 A. That is correct.
- 03:29 18 Q. In there, I'm asking you, simply, where did you put
- 03:29 19 together the prescription from Dr. Evers with the Methadone
- 03:29 20 that was in her system on the postmortem? Did you infer it?
- 03:30 21 A. Given the pattern of prescribing and the way in which Ms.
- 03:30 22 Dame used it, yes, I inferred it, particularly, given that the
- 03:30 23 last administered Methadone was from Horsham Clinic.
- 03:30 24 MR. BRIER: That's all I have, Your Honor.
- 03:30 25 THE COURT: Do you have redirect, Ms. Olshefski?

1 03.30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03.30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03:30

03:31

03:31

03:31

03:31

2

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Just a few questions, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. OLSHEFSKI: 3 03:30

> Dr. Thomas, based upon the assessment notes that the 4 Defense went over with you, June, October, November of '12, prior to March of '13, does that, in any way, change your

7 opinion? 03.30

8

9

11 I

12

16

20

No, because, while I had problems with the overall dosing and the approach, those were not the time -- that was not the 10 time frame during which I found the prescribing not for a medically legitimate purpose in the usual course of professional practice. It's the end of the time frame, not the

13 beginning. Okay. And, specifically, directing your attention to Page 141 Q.

64506, which was addressed by Defense counsel, under Available Old Data. Do you see that?

Yes. Α.

Q. Is it correct that --18I

> MR. BRIER: Your Honor, I object. This witness has already admitted, under oath, that these were not part of his expert reports and not part of his review. So why we're going through them, now, is, I think, the Government's attempt to bolster his credibility, when it's exactly what her objection was a minute ago.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, he's the one that brought this

17 l 03:31

19 03:31

21 03:31

22 03:31

23 03:31

24 03:31

25 03:31

03.31

up and directed Dr. Thomas' attention to it, and conveniently skipped over significant parts, leaving an impression that needs to be addressed here.

03:31

3

4

5

7 I

9

03:31

03:31

03:31

03.31

03.31

03:32

MR. BRIER: Your Honor, I addressed what was skipped over

pretty well, I believe.

6 03:31

thought was skipped over and then move on, because everybody is

THE COURT: You can address your questions to what you

moving past the target of a Daubert hearing, and I'm not going

to allow it. Go ahead.

10 03:32

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Just two points, Your Honor.

11 I 03:32

BY MS. OLSHEFSKI:

Dr. Thomas, do you see, under Available Old Data, June 20, 12 Q. 03:32

13 2012? 03:32

03:32

14 A. Yes.

03:32

15 Q. It reads, "Hospitalization because of drug withdrawal."

03:32

16 Α. Yes.

17 l 03:32

Q. And based upon what you're seeing there, does that change

03:32

your opinion, at all? 18 I

19 03:32

No, because, in fact, the Available Old Data section was Α.

20 03:32

21

present in other notes that I did review, because the

03:32

computerized medical record repeats it over and over, so I was

22 03:32

aware that Dr. Evers was aware of her hospitalizations for drug

23 03:32

withdrawal and her hospitalizations for fractures after fall

24 03:32

and her hospitalizations for detoxification from opioids and

03:32

25 benzodiazepines.

```
Then, right down from there, September 2, 2009, a few
         Q.
03.32
       2
         years prior.
03:32
               "Hospitalization for detoxification from opiates and
       3
03:32
         benzodiazepine."
       4
03:33
       5
               Did you come across that in your historical review of
03:33
       6
         Kristina Dame?
03:33
       7
         Α.
               Yes.
03.33
       8
         Q.
               Did it contribute to your opinion in this case?
03.33
       9
         Α.
               Yes.
03:33
      10
               MS. OLSHEFSKI: Thank you. Nothing further, Judge.
03:33
               THE COURT: Mr. Brier?
      11
03:33
      12
               MR. BRIER: Nothing further, Your Honor.
03:33
      13
               THE COURT: Thank you, Dr. Thomas. You can step down.
03:33
      14
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
03:33
      15
               THE COURT: Ms. Olshefski, does the Government propose to
03:33
         offer any additional witnesses in this matter?
      16
03:33
      17
               MS. OLSHEFSKI: Not for the Daubert hearing, Your Honor.
03:33
               THE COURT: I take it, Mr. Brier, that you have no
      18
03:33
      19
         witnesses in connection with the Daubert hearing?
03:33
               MR. BRIER: Correct, Your Honor.
      20
03:33
      21
               THE COURT: All right, now, we're going to try to move from
03:33
         the Daubert issue, unless there's some reason either counsel
      22
03:33
      23
         wants to further address it, which I'm not hearing, we will
03:33
      24
         move to the Motion to Suppress, with respect to Bennett Avenue.
03:33
      25
               There was some logistical issue we needed to talk about
03:33
```

03.34 2 03:34 03:34

4 03:34

03:34

03:34

03:34

03:34

5

6

03.34 03.34 9 03:34 10 03:34 11

13 03:34 141 03:34 15 03:34

12

16 03:34 17 l 03:34 18I

19 03:35

20

03:35

03:35

21 03:35 22 03:35 23 03:35

24 03:35

03:35

25

that I deferred until the Daubert hearing was over. This might be an appropriate time to hear both counsel as to what the issue is and what your positions are on it.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: If I may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: So if we're moving into the attack on the Affidavit of Probable Cause and, specifically, the Franks portion, Attorney Casey suggested putting on witnesses first, before the Government's witness establishes probable cause. The Government objects to any of these witnesses taking the stand to testify what they purport to testify to for our purposes here today, Your Honor, and this is why.

This is a Franks hearing. So pursuant to Franks v. Delaware, the purpose of a Franks hearing is to present evidence that false statements were intentionally and recklessly included in the Affidavit of Probable Cause or reckless disregard for those false statements or omissions were recklessly and intentionally omitted from the affidavit that were known to the affiant, at the time.

What the Defense purports to put up are witnesses consistent with the oaths that have been provided under seal to the Court and consistent with certain interview statements that were presented to the Government yesterday afternoon. Those witness statements refer to witnesses that were never interviewed, prior to the affidavit being written and

1 authorized and the search being executed in this case. So
 2 that's not the purpose of a Franks hearing, Your Honor.

The argument from the Defense is these are exculpatory, and it was incumbent upon DEA to go out and interview all of these witnesses to find out, to search for Brady information, before writing and submitting the affidavit in this case. And that's just not the law.

So 21 witnesses were interviewed, prior to the authorization and execution of this search warrant. If the Defense wants to bring in any one of those 21 witnesses and purport to show that Agent Derr intentionally and recklessly omitted information that would make a difference in the affidavit, then, he has the right to do that.

But what he's purporting to do is do bring in witnesses, never interviewed, who are going to say Dr. Evers prescribed in the usual course of professional practice, at all times the prescribing was appropriate. I think he's wonderful. That is what he is purporting to do, and pursuant to the interview statements I received yesterday, that's what they're going to testify to.

And that's not the law, Your Honor. And what I would say is, this is not a Brady, this is not application of Brady, when we're talking about a Franks hearing, and I would refer to United States v. Colkley, which is a Fourth Circuit case, which is kind of a hallmark case that many cases go back to and refer

03:35 **2**03:35 **3**03:35 **4**

03:36 **6**03:36 **7**

03:36

03.36

5

8

03:36 9 03:36 10 03:36 11 03:36 12

03:36 13

03:36

14

03:36 15 03:36 16 03:36 17 03:36 18

03:361903:3620

03:37
 21
 03:37
 22
 03:37
 23
 03:37
 24

03:37

25

03.37 03:37 03:37

4

7

8

9

13 l

17

5 03:37

03:37

03:37

03.37

03:37

03:38

03:38

03.37

101 03:37 11 03:38 12 03:38

14 03:38 15 03:38 16 03:38

18I 03:38 19 03:38 20 03:38

21 03:38

22 03:38 23 03:38 24 03:38 25 03:38

1 to, when this is an issue referring to omissions. I will also say that these cases that I'm going to cite refer to cases where a Franks hearing wasn't even granted, because this is not the law. So, in Colkley, the Fourth Circuit concluded that;

"The Defendant failed to show the officer intentionally misled the magistrate, when he applied for a warrant and omitted information from his affidavit."

In that case, the officer did not include information that six eyewitnesses were unable to identify the Defendant in a photo line up. That was omitted. The officer relied on a height description from one witness but did not include contradictory information obtained from another witness, stating the assailant was shorter than the Defendant.

The Fourth Circuit rejected the Plaintiff's argument that the Fourth Amendment requires the affiant to include all potentially exculpatory evidence.

And in this case, it was evidence known to the affiant. What they purport to do is to claim these omissions were intentionally and recklessly made by Agent Derr. He didn't interview them.

The Court went on to say;

"The rule would place an extraordinary burden on law enforcement officers who might have to follow up and include in a warrant affidavit every hunch and detail of an investigation in the futile attempt to prove the negative proposition that no

03:38 03:38 03:39

2

3

4

5

03.38

03:39 6
03:39 7
03:39 8
03:39 9
03:39 10

03:391103:3912

03:39

13

03:39 14 03:39 15 03:39 16 03:40 17

03:40 18 03:40 19 03:40 20 03:40 21 03:40 22 03:40 23 03:40 24

25

03:40

potential exculpatory evidence had been excluded. It would perforce result in perniciously prolix affidavits that would distract police officers from more important duties and render the magistrate's determination of probable cause unnecessarily burdensome.

"In addition, a broad duty of inclusion would turn every arrest or search into a warrant contest. Such consequences would, in turn, discourage reliance on the warrants, a result the Supreme Court has stated should be avoided in shaping the Fourth Amendment Doctrine."

That is United States v. Colkley, Your Honor, and that cite is 899 F2d. 297, it's a 1990 Fourth Circuit case.

Another case that relied on Colkley, Your Honor, is
Mauricia Harrington Wall v. The City of Monroe, this is a 2020
case out of the Western District of North Carolina. It's cited
at 2020 WL 6153086. And the Court in this case relied on
Colkley and other Supreme Court precedent in saying that;

"Although, an officer may not disregard readily available exculpatory evidence of which he is aware, the failure to pursue a potentially exculpatory lead is not sufficient to negate probable cause. Reasonable law enforcement officers are not required to exhaust every potentially exculpatory lead or resolve every doubt of a suspect's guilt before probable cause is established. Probable cause does not require an officer to be certain that subsequent prosecution of the arrest will be

03:40 1 successful."

This Court also said;

"Recognizing the decision not to pursue given investigative leads is but one of the circumstances we will consider in determining the reasonableness of an officer's decision to obtain an arrest warrant. The weight of such circumstances will, of course, vary widely depending upon the nature of the leads."

Again, this is referring to information that the Plaintiff in this case argued that law enforcement had a duty to go out and search. Just like in this case what the Defense is saying, Had the magistrate judge known about all these other witnesses that weren't interviewed that say, I think the prescribing of Dr. Evers was appropriate, the decision would have been different. And they have to say that it was intentionally and recklessly, and the law is, known to law enforcement officers.

So to equate this to Brady, that he should have gone out and searched for -- this isn't even Brady information, because they're not qualified witnesses to say that, I think Dr. Evers was wonderful and that he prescribed appropriately for me. In fact, pre-trial, the Defense filed motions to preclude Dr. Thomas from being able to say that, a Board certified anesthesiologist.

Pre-trial, the Defendant filed motions to preclude pharmacists from making that determination. And pre-trial, if

03:40 2 03:40 3 03:40 4 03:40 5 03:40 6 03:40 7

03:41

81

9 03:41 10 03:41 11 03:41 12 03:41 13 03:41 141 03:41 15 03:41 16 03:41

03:41 19 03:41 20 03:41 21

03:41

03:41

17

18I

03:41 22

03:41 23

24

03:41 25

03.41

03:42 **1**03:42 **2**

3

6

7

03:42 **4**03:42 **5**

03:42

03:42

03.42

03:42 **8**03:42 **9**

03:421003:4211

03:42 **12** 03:42 **13**

03:42 14

03:42 **15**

03:42

03:43

03:43

03:42 18 03:43 19

17

20

25 l

03:43
 21
 03:43
 22
 03:43
 23
 03:43
 24

there's another witness out there, anywhere, that theGovernment purports to put on the stand, they're not qualified.

So, now, to put this on now -- and I think he's thinking that the law is different because he's a doctor and because he's not a drug dealer on the street, and that's simply not the case, Your Honor. And I can go on and cite more cases, and I will cite them for the record.

United States v. Locklear, which is 2012 Westlaw 5845459 out of the Eastern District of North Carolina in 2012. The District Court -- four eye witnesses were interviewed and said the Defendant possessed a firearm. The Defendant claimed that, had the detective interviewed four additional witnesses, the opinion would have been different, and they would have said that the Defendant didn't possess a firearm.

The District Court, in rejecting to grant -- refused to even grant a Franks hearing and said;

"Interviewing every potential witness to a crime is not required in a PC, Probable Cause Affidavit. Courts do not require an officer applying for a search warrant to interview every potential witness to a crime."

I have more, United States v. Slizewski, which is 809 F3d. 382, the Seventh Circuit in 2016. Again, the Defendant said the District Court aired by not giving me a Franks hearing because the officer omitted exculpatory evidence. And the Seventh Circuit, again, reiterated that that's not the law. The Court

03.43 03:43 03:43 4 03:43 5 03:43 6 03:43

7 03:43 9 03:43 10 03:44

11

13

03.43

03:44 12 03:44

03:44

141 03:44 15 03:44 16 03:44

17 l 03:44 18 I 03:44

19 03:44

03:44

03.44

03:44

20

24

25

21 03:44 22 03:44 23 03:44

1 held that the officers are not expected to be attuned with every potential, every potential exculpatory piece of evidence out there against the Defendant. As long as there's probable cause in the affidavit, the Defense can't show recklessly made or false statements, then, that's what the Court needs to focus on.

So I would argue that if he wants to bring in witnesses, Judge, that were interviewed, and that the information is relevant, if they're going to say Agent Derr lied, that's one thing, but to bring in all of these people that say, I think Dr. Evers was wonderful, not qualified, not relevant, and it's not the law.

MR. CASEY: So, Judge, we have briefed the issue of Franks, the Government has just issued a recitation of citations, none of which relate to what's before the Court, which is an evidentiary issue. The Court is the finder of fact and the finder of law here. The Court will evaluate and make its own decision as to what's admissible and what's relevant to its decision, number one.

Number two, the Defense has asserted and will prove today that the Government affirmatively lied in the Affidavit of Probable Cause, which was tendered to the United States Magistrate Judge to obtain a search warrant. We would show that the Government was in reckless disregard for the truth. We will do that by calling witnesses who will review those facets of

03:45 3 03:45

4

10

11

03.45

03:45

03:45

03:45

03:45 03:45 7 I 03.45 03:45 9 03:45

12 03:45 13 03:45 141 03:45 **15** 03:45

16 03:46 17 03:46 18 I 03:46 19 03:46

20 03:46

21 03:46 22 03:46 23 03:46 24 03.46 25

03:46

1 the Affidavit of Probable Cause that relate to their name and 2 their information, and they will testify as to why that is not truthful information.

And if the Court thinks that the Defense is astray of what's relevant, I'm sure the Defense will be promptly notified as to the relevance of the utility to the Court of the evidence that we wish to adduce today. We have not summoned dozens of witnesses, we have tried to address the categories of misrepresentations by the Government, so they are somewhat representative.

These are people who have traveled over an hour, many of them are elderly or disabled, some are from young families. We would like to get on with the testimony and invite the Government to interpose their objection to the testimony as they see fit.

THE COURT: All right, let's speak for a moment about the purpose of this Franks hearing. We all understand the focus on Mr. Derr who is the Affiant in this case. We agree; right?

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. CASEY: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the contention by the Defendant is that Mr. Derr, in preparing the affidavit that led to issuance of the search warrant for the Bennett Avenue property included knowingly false and materially false statements that, were they excised from the Affidavit of Probable Cause, would be liable.

1 Isn't that what we're looking at here? 03.46 2 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Yes, Your Honor. 03:46 3 MR. CASEY: That is correct, Your Honor. 03:46 4 THE COURT: Now, from my perspective, I need to hear Mr. 03:46 Derr. I'm not comfortable, and I don't think it's prudent for 5 03:47 me to hear persons who may have relevant testimony, may not, I 03:47 don't know, but before I can even determine that, I need to 7 03.47 hear Mr. Derr's testimony and I need to hear your cross 03.47 examination of him, so that I can, at least, identify what 9 03:47 10 portions of his testimony you maintain were materially 03:47 knowingly false and make my own determination as to his 11 03:47 12 credibility as he testifies. 03:47 13 Only then, if I determine you should be allowed to present 03:47 14 additional witnesses, am I in a position to see whether that's 03:47 15 necessary. If I don't do it this way and I do it backwards, 03.47 it's not going to allow me to apply Franks and all of its 16I 03:48 progeny properly. 17 03:48 So I expect that you're going to call Mr. Derr now, are 18 03.48 you not? 19 03:48 20 MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, there's a standing issue, so we 03:48 21 do have one brief witness on standing. 03:48 MR. CASEY: Judge, we have standing witnesses, as well. So 22 03:48 23 I think that, given the Court's expression, I think we respect 03:48 24 that and I think we should get on with Mr. Derr and get to the 03.48

less significant issues or less significant witnesses to

25 l

03:48

03:48

03:48 **2**03:48 **3**

41

5

7

8

9

10

03:49 03:49

03:48

03:49

03.49

03:49

03:49

03:49 **11**

03:49 13

03:49 14

03:491503:491603:4917

03:49 18

03:49

19

03:49 **20**03:49 **21**03:49 **22**

03:50 23

03:50 24

03:50 25

1 follow, since it's not a requisite that we get through those.

THE COURT: Well, the standing issue, obviously, as I said in our telephone conference, is just part of the overall Fourth Amendment analysis I have to conduct. For economy of use of our time, if you're telling me that you have extensive testimony on standing, well, then, maybe we should put that later. But if it's something we can dispose of relatively quickly, I'd rather do that.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, we do have a witness here from Connecticut that traveled here last night, he is our witness on standing. It's the Government's position that the Defendant does not have standing to object to these medical records. They weren't his, he didn't own them, he couldn't prevent them from being turned over.

THE COURT: I understand the Government's position, and I understand -- at least, I think I understand -- that the whole purpose of the presentation of testimony will be to show that your assertions are correct.

But, again, this is just a matter of how we do this most efficiently. It's 20 to 3 in the afternoon, I'm willing to stay here all night if you want to get it done, but it's just a question of how we proceed. How many witnesses do you have on standing?

MR. CASEY: Three, Judge.

THE COURT: You have three. How many do you have?

1 MS. OLSHEFSKI: I have one. I don't think this witness will 03.50 2 be long, Your Honor, and then I can go right into --03:50 3 THE COURT: Well, let's take care of the standing issue, 03:50 since we're going to be staying here. 4 03:50 5 MR. CASEY: Well, Judge, if I may, just because I'm very 03:50 concerned about I have so many people, some in really difficult 03:50 7 conditions, it was a monumental task to get them here today. If 03:50 we could get her standing witness out of the way and go to Mr. 03.50 9 Derr, and then I'll call --03:50 10 THE COURT: Do you have an objection to that approach? 03:50 MS. OLSHEFSKI: I'm sorry, what was that? 11 03:50 12 MR. CASEY: The Court is not going to rule on standing 03:50 13 today, the Court is going to receive its information on 03:50 standing. Do you want to call your witness on standing, call 141 03:50 **15** him, we'll be done with him, then, we will move to Mr. Derr, 03:50 and then I'll call my standing witnesses --16I 03:50 MS. OLSHEFSKI: I'm sorry, but he has to be cross-examined 17 03:51 before you call those witnesses. 03:51 18I 19 THE COURT: Of course. 03:51 20 MR. CASEY: Yes, direct and cross-examine him. 03:51 21 MS. OLSHEFSKI: That was the plan, I think. 03:51 22 THE COURT: I think what Mr. Casey is suggesting is that 03:51 23 his standing witnesses would not follow your standing witness. 03:51 24 MR. CASEY: Exactly. 03:51 25 THE COURT: And instead, once we complete the examination 03:51

03:51 **1**03:51 **2**

03:51 3

4

6

10

15

03:51 5

03:51

03:51

04:21

04:21 7

04:21 **8**04:21 **9**

04:21 11

04:21 **12**04:21 **13**

04:21 14

04:21

04:21 **16**04:21 **17**

04:22 **18**

04:22 20

04:22 21

04:22 22

04:22 **24**

of your standing witness, we would proceed to Mr. Derr. So if that's an acceptable way to approach it, let's do that.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Fine, Judge.

THE COURT: Let's take a break. Regulations require that the witness box be cleaned, so we'll take five minutes.

(At this time a brief recess was taken.)

(The following took place in the conference room.)

THE COURT: I wanted to talk to you all about the posture of this particular motion. Franks requires that there be a preliminary finding that would then entitle the Defendant to the hearing. And it seems as though we may have skipped over that particular requirement, because I haven't written on whether or not you're entitled to a Franks hearing nor have I made a preliminary finding that you are entitled to one.

So that raises the question of whether today is an appropriate day to hold the kind of hearing that I think all of you were contemplating. Because, right now, it appears as though we're ready to do an actual Franks hearing, with cross examination of Mr. Derr, and then other testimony that, at least, from the standpoint of what you've told me, would attempt to show that his statements in the affidavit are materially and knowingly false.

But I've never made the initial determination that a Franks hearing is warranted, and, in fact, I don't think, under Franks, which I've just had an opportunity to review, that the

04:22 3 04:22

04.22

04:22

04.23

04:23

5 04:22 6 04:23

4

7 I

04:23 9 04:23 10

11 04:23 12 04:23 13 04:23

15 04:23

04:23

141

16 04:23 17 l 04:23

18I 04:24

04:24

20 04:24

19

21 04:24

22 04:24 23 04:24 24 04:24 25 04:24

Defendant has given me affidavits or other proof that would serve as a threshold basis for my determining that a Franks hearing is necessary.

So there's a couple ways to approach this, and it's going to require that you tell me what you want to do. One is to allow me to make a determination of whether or not you have made a preliminary -- the requisite preliminary showing that a Franks hearing is warranted here. If that were the case, we would not be taking testimony today in the manner in which we just discussed, other than on the standing issue.

The other -- and I'll turn to you, Michelle -- the other is to assume that a preliminary showing has been made and to go forward with this hearing and hear testimony as to whether or not there is anything materially false and knowingly false in the affidavit.

So I regard this as an important point because Franks and the case law under it is very specific in indicating you must make a preliminary showing before you get a Franks hearing.

MR. CASEY: Judge, may I speak?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. CASEY: In this case, we are not arguing that the Defense -- that the Government has a burden to search Brady material and give a balanced view, we are simply saying that when presenting, say -- I'll give an actual example -- the information of Dennis Braun who is listed in the Affidavit of

1 Probable Cause. The Government has intentionally misrepresented 04.24 the doctor-patient relationship in that information, and they 04:24 have put into the Affidavit of Probable Cause affirmative false 04:24 information. And we have obtained, pursuant to Franks v. 41 04:24 Delaware, 48 declarations under oath from each of those 5 04:24 witnesses. It's not all the people listed in the affidavit, but 04:24 7 it's over 40. 04.24

> THE COURT: And those you filed under seal with me? MR. CASEY: Yes. So the quantum of evidence of the false representations made by the Government, I would argue to the Court, is an abundance of evidence justifying a Franks hearing.

THE COURT: May I interrupt you?

MR. CASEY: Yes.

THE COURT: And I understand your position, that you have given me what you believe is a more than adequate basis to determine that a Franks hearing is necessary. I'm simply saying to all of you, I haven't made, on the record anywhere, a determination as to that.

MR. CASEY: I agree with you, Your Honor.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: So, Your Honor, what Pat is referring to in those oaths, for most of those patients that he's referring, we see 69 files. There are, probably, maybe, I don't know, six specific witnesses, patients that are individually spoken about in the affidavit, and then the only information after that about the other files of patients is PDMP data, high doses,

10 04:25 11

04:25

04:25

04:25

04:25

04:25

8

9

12 04:25

13 04:25

15 04:25 16

14

17 l 04:25

18I 04.25

19 04:25

20

21 04:25

04:25

22 04:25

23 04:26

24 04:26

25 04:26

04:26 1 extended period of time.

When they submitted these oaths, where they had their witnesses sign off, I believe it was a professional practice, legitimate medical purposes, the caveat is it mischaracterizes my treatment. They're not saying those numbers are wrong, they're saying, It mischaracterizes my treatment.

So that is not a false statement, that is not disregard for the truth. Those numbers are directly from the PDMP and their witnesses are saying, I'm not saying I wasn't taking those drugs, but they're mischaracterized. Falsely represents Dr. Evers' care of me. And that's not a false statement, that's their opinion, but that's not a false statement.

So that was the Government's issue. When we filed our responses to all these motions and went to the lengths we went to to attach DEA-6's to talk about -- to point the Court in specific portions of DEA-6's, I was shocked that the next day we had a hearing scheduled, because, quite frankly, I knew you hadn't had time to make that decision, because you were in trial with Phil Caraballo.

THE COURT: I was.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: So I was a little shocked, to tell you the truth, but I think the Court, and the Government's position would be to, please, make a decision on whether a Franks hearing is necessary at this point, based upon all the information that's there. Because there's a lot there.

04:26 2

04:26 04:26

41

5

6

04:26

04:26

04:26

04:26 7

04:26 9 04:26 10 04:26 11

04:27 12

04:27

04:27 14 04:27 15 04:27 16

13

04:27 17

04:27 19

04:27 20

04:27

04:27

21

24

04:27 **22**04:27 **23**

04:27 25

04:27 04:27 3 04:28 41 04:28 5 04:28 6 04:28 7 04.28

04:28

1

8

9 04:28 10 04:28 11 04:28 12 04:28 13 04:28 14 04:28 15 04:28

16

17

18I

04:28

04:28

04:29

19 04:29 20 04:29 21 04:29 22 04:29

23 04:29 24 04:29 25 04:29

MR. CASEY: Judge, if I may, I understand that the Government has the impression that the Defense is only taking issue with the proportionality of information, meaning, that the Government's recitation of the prescriptions is a misrepresentation of the entire treatment between the doctor and the patient, that's not what it's limited to. I'll give you an example, proffer, of the first witness that they will hear from.

This witness was interviewed by the Drug Enforcement Administration, Mr. Derr, himself, and she explained how she was treated by the doctor, her course of treatment, his examination, vital signs, all of that process, and then, at the end of the interview, she said, Dr. Evers is a good doctor, and she insisted that they put that down. None of that information is in the Affidavit of Probable Cause.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Doesn't have to be. Pat.

MR. CASEY: Which means that they intentionally misled the magistrate judge about the relationship between that lady who they interviewed and the characterization that they gave. Now, I understand that the Government wants to sit back and say, No harm, no foul, we just put in the pharmacy information. But that's not what the whole affidavit is about.

The Affidavit of Probable Cause is a reasonable belief that a crime is being committed by Martin Evers, and that there's a reasonable likelihood that the fruits of that crime 04:29 **2**04:29 **3**

4

7

9

10

13

04.29

04:29

04:29 5

04:30 04:30

04:30 11

04:30

04:30

04:30 12

04:30 14

04:30 **15** 04:30 **16**

04:30 17

04:30

04:31 19

18I

04:31 20

04:31 21

04:31 22

04:31 **23** 04:31 **24**

04:31 25

would be found at his address. To find that a physician is outside the usual course, they have to say he's prescribing outside the usual course. That's the intent of the information they put there.

When they have, themselves, interviewed the patient and misrepresented the information, that's the epitome of, at a minimum, reckless disregard for the truth or actual false statements, which I think the Court should hear from. And the Court can determine whether -- as we go through the witnesses, whether it's something the Court wishes to hear.

THE COURT: If the Government wants me to make the required preliminary showing, then, I think that's what I have to do.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: I would ask you to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't know that I'm, at all, comfortable ruling from the bench on that. I don't think that's the appropriate thing to do here. Both sides have raised significant points in their own -- in support of their respective positions, I don't want to, in the interest of simply concluding this matter, make a decision that's less than well thought out, and that is simply the basis of some consideration, now, leading to a bench ruling. I think that's a mistake.

Now, if counsel has a different view and really wants to go forward with this, I can do that, but I would suggest, I would suggest that we adhere to what I consider to be the

04:31 1
04:31 2
04:31 3
04:31 4
04:31 5
04:32 6

04:32 7 04:32 8 04:32 9 04:32 10

04:32 12

04:32

04:32

04:32

04:33

04:33

11

13

16

20

25

04:32 **14** 04:32 **15**

04:32 1704:33 1804:33 19

04:33
 04:33
 22
 04:33
 23
 04:33
 24

accepted approach, which is that I make a determination based on the affidavits that have been given to me as to whether you have now shown me you're entitled to a Franks hearing and look at the information that both of have you given me, rather than ignoring that preliminary obligation and going right into what is clearly a Franks hearing.

So that's my -- my intention is to do it by the book, so to speak, which means that, to the extent that this particular motion can be dealt with in parts, we can certainly hear the standing issue today.

MR. CASEY: Your Honor, I'd rather not do that, to be honest with you.

THE COURT: That's fine. But no preliminary determination was made by me. I think it warrants an opinion rather than a bench ruling. It isn't -- I don't take this lightly, obviously, and I think that's what has to be done.

When we had our telephone conference, I viewed it as a discussion about the suppression hearing nature of your motion, but I did not take into account the need for this preliminary determination.

MR. CASEY: If I may, Judge, at the risk of going against the wave of authority here, I don't know -- I would argue to the Court that it need not issue a separate opinion, it could hear arguments of counsel, and I could proffer, there are several witnesses here, and if the Court were comfortable

04:34 **1**04:34 **2**04:34 **3**

04:34 4

04:34

04:34

04:34

5

6 l

9

13

04:34 7

04:34 10

04:34 11

04:34 12

04:34

04:34 1404:34 1504:35 16

04:35 **17**

04:351904:352004:3521

04:35 22

04:35 24

04:35

23

04:35 25

making a bench ruling, then, so be it. If the Court were not, after hearing that information, comfortable making a bench ruling, then, I understand, and we could await the Court's ruling.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: The problem with that, Your Honor, from the Government's perspective, is, he only gets that opportunity if you grant him a Franks hearing, so that evidence should never be before the Court, unless there is a Franks hearing.

MR. CASEY: That's not true. I can submit and I have submitted 48 declarations under oath, testimony before the Court --

MS. OLSHEFSKI: The Court has them.

MR. CASEY: -- substantiating guidance from Franks v.

Delaware, the procedure to do so. I have witnesses here for whom I could make a proffer to the Court, in the presence of the witness, so that the Court has a more fulsome understanding of the magnitude of the falsifications by the Government in the Affidavit of Probable Cause. It's another level of support.

These people traveled in here, some have babysitters, some have medical appointments they've missed, some don't have the capacity to drive themselves or have spouses. Some are disabled.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: But that's not a basis to hear testimony, Pat.

MR. CASEY: It's evidence for the Court to consider.

04:35 **1**04:35 **2**

04:36

04.36

04:36

04:36

04:36

3

7

9

12

14

20

25

04:36 **4**04:36 **5**04:36 **6**

04:36

04:36 10 04:36 11

04:36 13

04:37
 04:37
 22
 04:37
 23
 04:37
 24

04:37

04:37

THE COURT: Well, I'm looking at an opinion of my own in another matter where we wrote;

"The preliminary showing a Defendant must make is no light burden and puts the Defendant to task by requiring some offer of proof that materially false statements were recklessly or intentionally made."

Citation to United States v. Darby. Then it continues.

"More specifically, a Defendant must allege with specificity what was false in the affidavit, must provide proof, must allege that the Affiant had a culpable state of mind and must allege that the remaining information is insufficient to support a finding of probable cause."

It continues on about;

"Conclusory allegations of untruthfulness are insufficient to meet this burden. Defendant must provide an offer of proof contradicting the Affiant, such as sworn or otherwise reliable statements from witnesses", citing to United States v. Yokshan, a Third Circuit 431 Federal Appendix 170, a 2011 case. And, in fact, Franks itself make the very same statement in almost the same language.

So it seems to me that I need to make a preliminary determination, based on your affidavits, as to whether or not you've established your right to a Franks hearing. I think to do it any other way would be error, and I'm sorry for the inconvenience that might arise as a consequence of this, due to

04:37 **1**04:37 **2**

4

5

8

10

04:37 04:37

04:37

04:37

04.37

04:38

04:37 7

04:37

04:38 11 04:38 12

04:38 13 04:38 14

04:38 15 04:38 16 04:38 17

04:38 18

04:38

04:38 20

19

04:38 21

04:38 22

04:38 23

04:38 24

04:38 25

the people who are here, but I'm not prepared to deviate from
what the Franks decision itself indicates, as well as the cases
that I've cited in other opinions.

So, now, if you want to take testimony on the issue of standing, you've got those people here today, I'm happy to hear that. That's entirely up to you, if you want to do it at another other, and all of this at once, we'll do that, as well.

MR. CASEY: I'd rather do it at another time, Your Honor.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: That's fine.

MR. CASEY: I do have a request of the Court that I be permitted to collect some of the information that these witnesses would have provided today to the Court and provide that as an affidavit, in addition to that which has already been submitted.

THE COURT: You can submit affidavits, I think you're entitled to do that. In light of the circumstances, if you think there's affidavits that you can put together in short order, yes, fine.

As far as concluding for today, I don't know whether you want to go back in to court to allow me to indicate what we have done, would that be your approach?

MR. CASEY: That would be very helpful, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay, let's do that.

MR. CASEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 04 - 38

04:47

04:47

04 - 48

04:48

04:48

04:48

04:48

(Discussion concluded in conference room.)

3 04:47

2

4

5

71

8

9

10

13

17 l

20

THE COURT: Mr. Casey, in support of your request for a Franks hearing, would you state for the record the number of affidavits that you have submitted in support of that request?

04:47 04:48

MR. CASEY: Yes, Your Honor. 48 declarations under oath from witnesses, over 40 of whom were identified in the search warrant to establish probable cause for the search of the doctor's office.

04:48 04:48

THE COURT: Ms. Olshefski, earlier in this hearing, you indicated that, in response to that -- and I think it's in your memorandum, as well -- you submitted affidavits.

11 04:48

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor --

12 04:48

> THE COURT: Actually, you submitted the DEA-6's, did you not?

14 04:48

MS. OLSHEFSKI: The DEA-6's, as well as the affidavit of

15 04:48 16 04:48

Agent Derr, with a list of the patients that were actually interviewed pre-affidavit. THE COURT: All right. I've taken this time, as counsel

18 04:48 19 l 04:48

for the type of hearing that we need to hold here, and what

knows, to consult the decision in Franks, which is the basis

21 04:48

Franks requires is a preliminary finding by me, as the Judge

22 04:48

assigned to this case, based on the affidavits you've given me, Mr. Casey, and any rebuttal that you provided, Ms. Olshefski,

23 04:49 24 04:49

and that preliminary finding has not been made by me.

25 04:49

Under Franks, a preliminary finding of that nature is

04:49 **2**04:49 **3**

04 - 49

04:49 4
04:49 5
04:49 6
04:49 7
04:49 8
04:49 9

04:49

04:49

10I

11

04:50 12
04:50 13
04:50 14
04:50 15
04:50 16
04:50 17

04:50 19 04:50 20 04:50 21 04:50 22 04:50 23

04:50 **24** 04:50 **25**

required before a Franks hearing may be held. And I'll just briefly quote from the Supreme Court's decision in Franks, where they say;

"We hold that when the Defendant makes a substantial preliminary showing that a false statement knowingly and intentionally or with reckless disregard for the truth was included by the affiant in the warrant affidavit, and if the allegedly false statement is necessary to the finding of probable cause, the Fourth Amendment requires that a hearing be held at the Defendant's request.

"In the event that, at that hearing, the allegations of perjury or reckless disregard is established by the Defendant, by a preponderance of the evidence, and with the affidavit's false material set to one side, the affidavit's remaining content is insufficient to establish probable cause, the search warrant must be voided and the fruits of the search excluded, to the same extent as if probable cause was lacking on the face of the affidavit."

That is the decision in Franks quoted verbatim, and the preliminary finding that would entitle your client to a Franks hearing is something I must make, and as a matter of the Franks decision, we cannot proceed to an evidentiary hearing unless I make that preliminary finding first, and I haven't done that.

So for that reason, we cannot proceed today to hold the Franks evidentiary hearing that you are seeking. So what I will

04:51 **1**04:51 **2**

3

5

9

10

04:51 4

04:51

04:51

04:51

04:51

04:51

04:51 7

04:51

04:51 11

04:51 12

04:51 13

04:51 14

04:51 15

04:52 16

04:52

04:52

04:52 18

17

19

04:52 20

04:52 21

04:52 22

04:52 23

04:52 24

04:52 25

do is I will make -- I will review the materials you've submitted, you've indicated, I think, that you wish to submit something else as well.

MR. CASEY: Yes, if I may, Judge, I don't want to interrupt you. So a number of the witnesses that were here today, I would get affidavits to supplement the record. I suspect I could get that done within 30 days, Your Honor. And I appreciate the Court's consideration that a number of these witnesses came from over an hour away and have interrupted their families and stuff, that's on me, and I'll collect that information and submit it to the Court for the Court's evaluation.

I have one other argument, but I'll pause here until then.

THE COURT: Ms. Olshefski, do you have any objection to that approach?

MS. OLSHEFSKI: No, Your Honor. Perhaps, the Government would have an opportunity to respond?

THE COURT: Sure. But, again, the point here is the law requires, before I proceed to have the Franks hearing that the Defendant is seeking, I must make a preliminary finding that there is a basis to do so, that has not been done by me, and I can't omit a step in the process, even though, by not omitting it, there's some inconvenience, obviously, to everyone involved in the proceeding.

I'm sorry, Mr. Casey, you were about to say something?

MR. CASEY: I know the Court knows this, but there is also

 04:52
 1

 04:52
 2

 04:52
 3

 04:52
 4

 04:53
 5

 04:53
 6

 04:53
 7

04:53 **8**04:53 **9**04:53 **10**

04:531104:531204:5313

04:53 14 04:53 15 04:53 16 04:53 17 04:53 18

04:532004:5321

04:53

19

04:53 22

04:53 23

24

to that.

04:54 25

04:53

a facet -- although, the Franks dominates the interest and it
is the decision that has to be made for efficiency of testimony
-- there is also a probable cause argument, like a traditional
suppression issue, but if Diversion Investigator Derr is going
to testify it's more efficient for judicial resources to have
that done and Franks decided, either it's in or it's out, we
would know the scope of the examination.

As the Court alluded to earlier, you've got to hear from the case agent first, and then the Court can be informed as to how to proceed.

THE COURT: I think, should a Franks hearing, ultimately, be held, that holding that along with the traditional inquiry into probable cause would be the appropriate way to proceed.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: Your Honor, I would agree with that, and I would also agree that Your Honor has to make the decision whether or not there is probable cause, sufficient probable cause, based upon everything that has been submitted in support of false statements, as well, in addition to the Franks hearing.

THE COURT: That's certainly true. Mr. Casey has asked for 30 days to submit his affidavits.

MS. OLSHEFSKI: No problem with that, Judge.

THE COURT: Do you need additional time to submit anything?

MS. OLSHEFSKI: I would request, like, 14 days subsequent

1 THE COURT: Fine. Now, the last issue before, I believe, we 04 - 54 can adjourn for the day is whether you wish to submit --04:54 returning to the Daubert issue -- whether you intend to submit 3 04:54 any further briefing on that? 4 04:54 MS. CONABOY: Yes, Your Honor. If we could submit that at 5 04:54 the same time, within 30 days. 6 04:54 7 THE COURT: Sure. Ms. Olshefski? 04.54 MS. OLSHEFSKI: The Government does not believe that 8 04 - 54 9 further briefing on the Daubert issue is necessary, however, if 04:54 10 the Defense submits something, the Government would like to 04:54 respond within 14 days. 11 04:54 THE COURT: All right. And both requests are granted. 12 04:54 13 Before we close, is there anything else that we need to discuss 04:54 14 to keep this case on track? 04:54 15 MR. CASEY: Not from the Defense, Judge. Thank you. 04:54 MS. OLSHEFSKI: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 16 04:54 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel, for your 04:54 assistance and input in this matter. We will proceed as we have 18 I 04:54 19 outlined here. Thank you. 04:55 20 (At this time the proceedings were adjourned.) 04:55 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

71

9

1

I, KRISTIN L. YEAGER, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the within-mentioned proceedings had in the above-mentioned and numbered cause on the date or dates hereinbefore set forth; and 10 I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my supervision.

12

13

14

11

S/Kristin L. Yeager KRISTIN L. YEAGER, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter

15

REPORTED BY:

16 17

18

19

KRISTIN L. YEAGER, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Middle District of Pennsylvania P.O. Box 5 Scranton, Pennsylvania 18501

20

21

22

23

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)

24

25

12[1] - 117:5 13[1] - 117:6 0 0057[1] - 100:20	1983 [1] - 83:13 1984 [1] - 9:6 1988 [1] - 79:22 1990 [1] - 123:12 1992 [4] - 8:20, 8:21, 12:17, 13:1 1996 [2] - 41:25, 78:17 1998 [2] - 40:24, 50:21 1999 [3] - 13:2, 13:5, 13:16	2018 [1] - 68:1 2019 [8] - 3:12, 50:2, 66:9, 68:1, 70:11, 71:16, 89:3, 112:13 2020 [8] - 5:23, 8:4, 66:12, 71:17, 89:3, 104:21, 123:14, 123:16 2021 [1] - 1:10 21 [11] - 40:16, 44:24, 45:12, 47:9, 47:17,	400 [3] - 101:8, 101:17, 102:1 425 [1] - 1:18 431 [1] - 139:18 48 [3] - 133:5, 138:10, 141:5 49 [5] - 43:14, 43:23, 50:15, 60:6, 72:1	809 [1] - 125:21 829 [4] - 47:10, 47:17, 47:22, 71:24 84 [1] - 113:4 899 [1] - 123:12 9 9 [9] - 5:23, 68:9, 69:22, 70:2, 72:4, 72:11, 85:20, 92:15,
1 _[11] - 7:21, 7:23, 8:6, 8:9, 8:10, 28:20, 68:22, 111:9, 111:11, 111:12, 113:2 10 _[14] - 24:18, 24:19, 24:20, 25:5, 27:18, 27:21, 27:22, 28:16, 28:17, 28:24, 29:3,	2 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	47:22, 71:23, 121:8, 121:10 21st [1] - 20:19 22 [1] - 108:20 235 [2] - 1:14, 1:24 24 [3] - 26:18, 107:15, 115:3 25 [3] - 48:15, 49:17,	5 [7] - 44:25, 47:1, 56:11, 71:22, 72:11, 113:14, 146:18 50 [4] - 12:24, 68:24, 98:21 56 [2] - 26:19, 114:24 5845459 [1] - 125:8 59 [1] - 100:6	111:8 9/25/14 [2] - 100:25, 101:1 90 [2] - 75:19, 75:20 95 [2] - 75:19, 75:20 9:00 [1] - 85:18
72:6, 72:12, 113:16 10/11/2012[1] - 105:6 100 [5] - 13:8, 29:5, 75:21, 76:6, 92:7 104 [1] - 3:11 10:30 [1] - 1:10 10mg [1] - 63:19 11 [3] - 1:10, 35:10, 109:19 1100 [1] - 68:12 12 [4] - 29:4, 66:9, 71:16, 89:3 12/25/14 [1] - 100:24 12/4/2012 [1] - 107:6 12/8/14 [2] - 100:23, 101:3 1200 [2] - 29:6, 68:12 1306.04 [3] - 44:24, 45:13, 71:23 14 [2] - 144:24, 145:11 15 [3] - 20:17, 72:18, 108:2 15.92 [2] - 40:16 150 [1] - 113:14 16.92 [1] - 43:23 160 [2] - 112:23, 113:20 1692 [5] - 43:14, 43:25, 44:21, 60:7, 72:2 170 [1] - 139:18	29:1, 29:2, 54:24, 67:10, 68:22, 68:24, 69:15, 70:1, 83:14, 104:10, 104:13, 104:17, 111:12, 118:12, 129:20 200 [4] - 56:9, 69:7, 69:8, 69:12 2000 [3] - 12:17, 22:14, 75:13 2002 [3] - 14:3, 14:5, 14:8 2004 [3] - 40:25, 41:11, 42:2 2005 [1] - 20:20 2007 [2] - 23:11, 42:2 2008 [1] - 78:11 2009 [4] - 42:6, 50:22, 106:3, 119:1 2011 [5] - 21:16, 42:3, 78:18, 78:19, 139:18 2012 [6] - 106:1, 106:8, 109:19, 118:13, 125:8, 125:9 2013 [15] - 40:25, 41:4, 41:19, 49:25, 50:8, 58:17, 92:14, 104:10, 104:13, 104:15, 104:18, 104:20, 108:3, 108:20, 109:6 2014 [14] - 14:4, 14:5, 14:8, 35:10, 58:17,	71:22 25.52 [1] - 48:22 2552 [1] - 49:18 260 [1] - 100:8 28 [2] - 71:22, 146:6 280 [1] - 100:5 297 [1] - 123:12 3 3 [11] - 22:17, 56:11, 66:5, 66:6, 66:11, 71:15, 71:16, 71:18, 72:11, 113:3, 129:20 3/20 [1] - 109:4 30 [11] - 29:12, 30:12, 64:8, 64:20, 67:11, 76:4, 77:17, 98:19, 143:7, 144:21, 145:6 300 [1] - 96:12 309 [1] - 1:14 30th [1] - 76:11 3100 [3] - 96:13, 96:24, 100:3 32 [1] - 69:10 35 [1] - 67:22 36 [1] - 113:5 360 [1] - 63:19 382 [1] - 125:22 3C [1] - 3:12	6 6 [9] - 47:6, 47:7, 47:12, 48:9, 71:23, 72:11, 92:14, 104:15, 104:20 60 [6] - 29:1, 29:3, 96:12, 96:23, 100:3 6153086 [1] - 123:16 64506 [2] - 105:16, 117:15 64562 [1] - 109:5 64563 [1] - 108:18 64564 [1] - 107:25 64565 [1] - 107:13 64566 [1] - 107:4 64567 [1] - 105:1 69 [1] - 133:22 6th [1] - 3:12 7 7 [13] - 27:11, 27:16, 27:17, 37:1, 49:21, 50:3, 66:12, 71:17, 71:24, 72:11, 85:17, 85:20, 89:3 70 [1] - 113:15 702 [2] - 102:25, 103:4 75 [1] - 10:23 753 [1] - 146:6	A.M [1] - 1:10 a.m [2] - 85:17, 85:20 abdomen [2] - 109:13, 109:14 able [4] - 52:17, 65:10, 93:10, 124:22 above-mentioned [1] - 146:8 absence [3] - 54:7, 62:24, 101:10 absolutely [4] - 34:12, 54:21, 60:24, 111:17 abstinence [1] - 113:19 abstract [1] - 91:23 abundance [1] - 133:11 abuse [8] - 17:25, 54:1, 55:17, 57:25, 61:22, 63:10, 102:6 Academy [1] - 41:24 accelerators [1] - 114:25 acceptable [1] - 131:2 accepted [3] - 34:4, 57:13, 137:1 access [5] - 58:18, 58:19, 58:23, 59:3, 59:4 accidents [1] - 64:25 accomplishments [1] - 4:14
180 [8] - 96:3, 96:5, 96:19, 97:19, 99:5, 99:17, 99:18, 99:24 18501 [1] - 146:19 18503 [3] - 1:15, 1:19, 1:25 19 [4] - 56:7, 69:2, 69:4, 109:6 19-CR-250 [1] - 1:5	58:24, 59:1, 59:4, 76:4, 77:17, 87:17, 92:15, 93:2, 112:25 2015 [2] - 58:20, 79:22 2016 [5] - 41:14, 41:19, 68:6, 87:16, 125:22 2017 [1] - 58:22	4 _[10] - 3:7, 3:14, 28:21, 28:22, 48:14, 48:22, 71:21, 72:11, 101:5 4.5 _[1] - 112:4 40 _[8] - 12:4, 23:14, 28:25, 29:2, 98:19, 133:7, 141:6	8 8 [5] - 43:13, 72:1, 72:11, 106:8, 113:17 8,000 [2] - 37:1, 115:25 80 [2] - 111:9, 111:11	accordance [3] - 3:6, 34:4, 86:15 according [3] - 87:19, 102:11, 104:17 account [6] - 19:23, 111:14, 112:8, 112:10, 113:15, 137:19

accurate [1] - 45:9 achieves [1] - 55:8 Act [5] - 19:13, 19:14, 22:14, 40:12, 48:15 act [8] - 17:14, 18:10, 28:3, 31:25, 33:20, 48:18, 59:25, 64:15 acted [2] - 18:10, 32:1 acting [5] - 23:24, 23:25, 45:16, 60:2, 64:13 active [6] - 11:7, 17:10, 63:15, 76:3, 93:1, 93:19 activities [1] - 74:17 activity [1] - 40:19 acts [1] - 23:22 actual [6] - 34:23, 91:16, 131:18, 132:24, 136:7 acute [3] - 17:1, 27:8, 93:4 acutely [1] - 28:14 add [2] - 25:23, 64:1 added [1] - 77:11 addicted [1] - 20:25 Addiction [2] - 18:8, 22:14 addiction [14] - 12:12, 17:22, 17:25, 18:7, 18:9, 21:12, 22:15, 22:16, 22:19, 22:22, 22:25, 23:5, 27:5, 32:19 addictive [1] - 44:11 addition [6] - 4:13, 12:20, 26:24, 123:6, 140:13, 144:18 additional [11] - 6:6, 9:25, 19:21, 89:14, 89:23, 104:23, 119:16, 125:12, 128:14, 144:23 additionally [4] - 38:2, 41:20, 96:13, 96:14 address [5] - 21:8, 118:6, 119:23, 127:8, 136:1 addressed [3] -117:15, 118:3, 118:4 adduce [1] - 127:7 adequate [8] - 37:25, 57:2, 57:3, 57:7, 64:11, 107:20, 108:21, 133:15 adhere [1] - 136:25 adjacent [1] - 110:10 adjourn [1] - 145:2 adjourned [1] - 145:20 administered [2] -

113:9, 116:23 Administering [2] -44:20, 72:3 administering [2] -40:17. 43:16 administration [4] -25:14, 26:6, 65:1, 81:10 Administration [1] -135:10 administrative [3] -18:15, 40:15, 40:21 administratively [1] -40:19 admissibility [1] -73:12 admissible [1] -126:18 admission [5] - 6:7, 8:5, 27:15, 71:15, 71.20 admitted [9] - 5:8, 8:9, 8:10, 27:21, 27:22, 72:6, 72:12, 72:13, 117:20 admitting [1] - 14:12 adopted [1] - 50:19 adulterants [1] - 54:15 advance [1] - 66:20 advise [2] - 33:11, 43:23 advisories [1] - 68:16 aesthetically [1] -62.14 Affairs [1] - 18:12 affects [1] - 94:17 affiant [4] - 120:19, 122:15, 122:17, 142:7 Affiant [3] - 127:18, 139:10, 139:16 Affidavit [11] - 120:7, 120:16, 125:18, 126:21, 127:1, 127:25, 132:25, 133:3, 135:15, 135:23, 138:18 affidavit [19] - 120:18, 120:25, 121:6, 121:13, 122:7, 122:24, 126:4, 127:22, 131:21, 132:15, 133:6, 133:24, 135:22, 139:9, 140:13, 141:15, 141:17, 142:7, 142:18 affidavit's [2] -

142:13, 142:14

affidavits [11] - 123:2,

132:1, 137:2, 139:22, 140:15, 140:17, 141:4, 141:11, 141:22, 143:6, 144:21 affirmatively [1] -126:21 affirmed [1] - 5:14 after-the-fact [1] -58:12 afternoon [4] - 74:3, 74:4, 120:23, 129:20 AG's [1] - 19:3 Agent [5] - 35:16, 121:11, 122:19, 126:9, 141:16 agent [1] - 144:9 agents [1] - 82:13 ago [3] - 82:1, 86:8, 117:24 agonism [1] - 28:4 agonists [1] - 25:11 agree [11] - 48:5, 49:8, 87:16, 89:10, 97:3, 97:18, 110:17, 127:18, 133:19, 144:14, 144:15 agreed [1] - 65:12 ahead [1] - 118:9 aided [1] - 1:22 Air [4] - 11:5, 11:7, 11:8, 11:11 aired [1] - 125:23 airway [2] - 62:21, 64:18 alcohol [1] - 57:25 alert [3] - 41:9, 46:12, 46:17 alerts [2] - 47:19, 52:9 alive [5] - 85:17, 93:7, 93:18, 94:4, 94:7 allegations [2] -139:14, 142:11 allege [6] - 4:25, 5:1, 5:2, 139:8, 139:10, 139.11 alleged [2] - 4:5, 19:17 allegedly [2] - 108:21, 142:8 allow [7] - 38:5, 38:8, 103:23, 118:9, 128:16, 132:6, 140:20 allowed [13] - 5:6, 22:14, 22:16, 22:21, 23:1, 23:4, 41:21, 51:12, 60:17, 102:25, 103:4, 103:5, 128:13 alluded [1] - 144:8

almost [1] - 139:19 alongside [1] - 16:22 alter [1] - 59:5 AMA[1] - 87:19 amended [1] - 112:17 Amendment [4] -122:15, 123:10, 129:4, 142:9 **AMERICA**[1] - 1:3 America [1] - 52:5 American [9] - 4:14, 15:24, 16:4, 16:8, 18:8, 41:24, 42:6, 78:25 amount [4] - 25:25, 26:21, 98:4, 98:17 amounts [1] - 99:18 analgesia [1] - 68:20 analgesic [3] - 26:8, 27:7, 27:9 Analgesics [2] - 50:7, 71:25 analgesics [5] - 18:1, 42:1, 51:3, 51:18, 63:3 analysis [4] - 76:15, 114:11, 115:6, 129:4 anatomical [1] - 95:3 anatomically [1] -95:19 anatomy [1] - 10:15 AND [1] - 6:20 anecdotal [1] - 87:13 Anesthesia [3] -11:13, 11:20, 12:16 anesthesia [13] - 9:12, 10:12, 11:20, 12:19, 12:24, 13:8, 13:14, 13:21. 32:15. 67:3. 91:18, 93:12, 93:13 anesthesiologist [6] -8:16, 66:19, 67:18, 75:8, 95:1, 124:23 Anesthesiologist [2] -11:10, 11:19 anesthesiologists [1] - 12:4 Anesthesiology [10] -4:15, 9:14, 10:1, 10:20, 15:24, 74:20, 74:21, 75:2, 75:3, 75:5 anesthesiology [7] -9:9, 9:11, 9:22, 9:24, 10:5, 10:7, 91:13 anesthetic [3] - 67:1, 67:2, 67:5

anesthetics [6] - 10:2,

10:4, 10:5, 10:16,

62:14, 93:23

ankle [1] - 108:23 answer [1] - 99:11 answered [1] - 94:1 anti [3] - 16:18, 82:3, 82:13 anti-convulsants [1] -16:18 anti-depressants [2] -82:3, 82:13 antibiotic [1] - 83:1 antibiotics [7] - 82:5, 82:15, 82:16, 82:17, 82:18, 82:25, 83:3 anticipate [2] - 88:18, 88:19 anticonvulsants [1] -82:14 anxiety [1] - 58:2 apneic [1] - 62:9 apologize [2] - 89:17, 89:25 appeal [1] - 5:13 Appendix [1] - 139:18 application [2] -88:16, 121:22 applied [6] - 17:3, 55:6, 58:16, 70:12, 122.6 applies [2] - 19:13, 19:14 **apply** [12] - 5:4, 41:12, 51:16, 70:7, 87:7, 87:20, 88:5, 88:12, 98:13, 128:16, 146:22 applying [1] - 125:19 appointed [2] - 10:22, 146:5 appointments [1] -138:20 appreciably [1] -115:5 appreciate [2] - 72:22, 143.7 apprising [1] - 73:8 approach [13] - 33:10, 37:2, 37:8, 54:18, 56:2, 87:25, 117:9, 130:10, 131:2, 132:4, 137:1, 140:21, 143:14 appropriate [20] -10:8, 16:15, 18:18, 21:3, 51:6, 52:19, 52:22, 54:9, 54:10, 55:7, 56:1, 57:3, 73:9, 102:23, 120:2, 121:17, 124:14, 131:16, 136:16, 144:13

appropriately [4] -53:2, 53:17, 55:17, 124:20 approved [1] - 22:18 approving [1] - 5:23 **April** [1] - 71:16 area [11] - 4:18, 4:20, 11:21, 47:16, 47:17, 72:25, 79:4, 79:7, 88:21, 114:7 areas [4] - 32:23, 41:6, 51:6, 110:4 argue [4] - 6:5, 126:7, 133:10, 137:22 argued [1] - 124:10 argues [1] - 5:20 arguing [1] - 132:21 argument [6] - 6:15, 73:13, 121:3, 122:14, 143:12, 144:3 arguments [1] -137:24 arise [1] - 139:25 arising [1] - 18:7 arms [1] - 29:18 arrangement [1] -38:19 arrest [4] - 35:19, 123:7, 123:25, 124:6 **arrhythmia**[1] - 81:3 arrhythmias [2] -26:25, 81:10 article [6] - 42:6, 54:24, 91:16, 91:17, 91:20, 91:22 articles [1] - 91:12 AS[1] - 6:21 aspect [1] - 73:16 aspects [2] - 31:4, 97:14 assailant [1] - 122:13 asserted [1] - 126:20 **assertion** [1] - 99:9 assertions [1] -129:18 assessment [5] - 16:6, 105:23, 105:24, 107:22, 117:4 Assessment[1] -106:13 assigned [2] - 11:8, 141:22 assistance [1] -145:18 Assistant [3] - 1:13, 11:12, 73:11 associated [14] - 18:3, 23:14, 26:5, 30:3, 30:6, 30:7, 30:8,

35:5, 52:1, 52:6, 61:23, 63:11, 69:17, 69:20 Associates [2] -11:20, 12:16 Association [1] -78:25 associations [1] -43:5 assume [1] - 132:12 assured [1] - 55:7 astray [1] - 127:4 attach [1] - 134:15 attack [2] - 102:22, 120:6 attacking [3] - 15:7, 116:8, 116:10 attempt [6] - 5:6, 86:14, 87:5, 117:22, 122:25, 131:21 attempting [2] - 12:14, 37:20 attended [1] - 76:20 attention [10] - 24:17, 25:4, 37:14, 43:12, 47:5, 48:12, 49:21, 68:8, 117:14, 118:1 Attorney [4] - 1:13, 19:2, 73:11, 120:8 ATTORNEY'S [1] -1:12 attuned [1] - 126:1 atypical [1] - 59:17 **audience** [1] - 21:8

ATTORNEYS [1] 1:12
attuned [1] - 126:1
atypical [1] - 59:17
audience [1] - 21:8
audiences [1] - 21:9
August [4] - 3:12,
66:9, 89:3, 112:13
authored [9] - 3:25,
5:22, 66:9, 66:12,
89:1, 90:22, 103:2,
104:4, 104:22
authoring [1] - 91:25
authorities [5] - 39:23,
40:1, 42:22, 60:5,
71:21

authority [2] - 6:3, 137:22 authorization [1] -121:9

authorized [2] - 45:23, 121:1

Autolysis [1] - 97:6 autolysis [4] - 84:20, 84:22, 97:4, 97:12 autopsies [6] - 83:12, 83:14, 83:15, 86:8, 86:11, 94:2

autopsy [8] - 35:2, 83:10, 83:13, 84:17, 84:19, 92:9, 99:22,

115:12 avail [1] - 90:10 Available [4] - 110:13, 117:15. 118:12. 118:19 available [11] - 58:25, 86:15, 87:1, 87:6, 89:13, 89:15, 89:23, 92:5, 104:8, 105:25, 123:18 availed [1] - 90:13 availing [2] - 90:10, 90:14 Avenue [4] - 1:14, 3:11, 119:24, 127:23 **AVENUE** [1] - 1:24 average [5] - 26:17, 100:5, 100:7, 100:8, 113:18 avoided [1] - 123:9 await [1] - 138:3 awakening [1] - 62:15 aware [9] - 51:8, 67:25, 81:2, 81:6, 81:8, 104:12, 118:22, 123:19

В

axiom [2] - 25:20, 55:5

babysitters [1] -138:19 back-drop [1] - 42:3 background [4] -44:23, 50:25, 66:18, 66:20 backside [1] - 86:6 backwards [1] -128:15 baclofen [2] - 13:6, 13:12 **bad** [4] - 39:9, 57:19, 57:20, 57:24 bag [1] - 23:18 balance [3] - 18:3, 18:9, 22:2 balanced [1] - 132:23 **Baltimore** [2] - 9:9, 9:23 base [2] - 37:24, 67:23 based [27] - 38:10, 42:20, 47:4, 53:15, 57:2. 57:10. 65:7. 77:19, 79:15, 80:15, 86:13, 86:14, 86:15, 86:20, 86:21, 86:25, 99:8, 99:16, 103:22, 114:17, 117:4, 118:17, 134:24, 137:1, 139:22,

141:22, 144:17 basic [1] - 27:14 basis [12] - 3:16, 14:8, 42:7. 58:6. 89:7. 103:3. 132:2. 133:15, 136:20, 138:23. 141:19. 143:20 bathes [1] - 109:25 bears [1] - 46:15 became [3] - 14:3, 20:21, 58:21 become [6] - 10:21, 10:24, 17:24, 51:18, 52:2, 62:9 becomes [2] - 37:20, 89:14 BEEN [1] - 6:21 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:10 beforehand [1] -57:23 began [2] - 13:8, 51:21 begin [3] - 6:14, 24:7, 83:1 beginning [4] - 20:20, 23:11, 25:22, 117:13 begins [2] - 56:8, 69.17 behalf [5] - 3:8, 6:11, 73:24, 76:16, 76:21 behavior [9] - 19:23. 39:15, 40:10, 40:14, 41:16, 42:12, 54:2, 64:12, 88:21 behind [1] - 20:7 belief [1] - 135:23

138:1, 138:2 beneficial [1] - 52:24 benefit [2] - 27:9, 60:12 Bennett [3] - 3:11, 119:24, 127:23 benzodiazepine [5] -58:21, 64:2, 64:7,

believability [1] -

below [1] - 111:13

bench [5] - 136:15,

136:21, 137:15,

103:24

65:1, 119:4 benzodiazepines [6] -64:5, 64:15, 64:22, 106:4, 110:15, 118:25 best [6] - 26:1, 56:16,

best [6] - 26:1, 56:16, 68:18, 86:15, 86:25, 87:6

between [15] - 13:1, 18:9, 22:2, 41:19,

63:3, 68:22, 68:24, 70:16, 85:20, 90:14, 96:12, 96:23, 98:19, 135:5, 135:18 beyond [2] - 23:7, 115:1 bibliography [3] -91:14, 91:15, 91:23 big [1] - 70:21 **binder** [10] - 7:2, 7:5, 7:19, 7:22, 24:18, 43:13, 68:9, 100:20, 100:21, 104:25 **binding** [2] **-** 6:4, 6:5 Biology [1] - 9:2 bit [3] - 35:22, 42:23, 73:21 black [2] - 23:11, 24:9 blind [2] - 87:2, 87:11 blinded [1] - 56:22 **bliss** [1] - 59:23 blockage [1] - 110:2 **blocking** [1] - 64:16 blocks [1] - 14:20 blood [20] - 62:18, 62:22, 63:14, 67:16, 85:5, 85:12, 94:15, 94:19, 95:3, 95:17, 95:19, 95:20, 95:24, 96:7, 97:8, 97:9, 97:10, 97:19, 98:11, 100:5 Board [14] - 4:14. 15:23, 15:24, 16:4,

Board [14] - 4:14, 15:23, 15:24, 16:4, 16:9, 18:22, 18:24, 50:20, 50:21, 51:1, 77:4, 77:11, 77:22, 124:22 **board** [3] - 21:1,

50:20, 52:9 **Board's** [3] - 50:6, 50:16, 60:10 **Boards** [3] - 40:22

Boards [3] - 40:22, 41:7, 50:12 **boards** [3] - 43:5,

49:22, 50:13 **bodies** [2] - 26:21, 30:2

body [11] - 23:21, 23:22, 23:25, 24:5, 26:15, 26:16, 86:1, 96:1, 102:11, 102:14, 112:6 bolster [1] - 117:22

Bon [1] - 36:12 **bone** [1] - 30:3 **bones** [1] - 29:19 **book** [2] - 50:23,

bottle [2] - 115:15,

137:7

115:23 bottom [3] - 101:2, 101:15, 109:20 bounds [1] - 18:18 Box [2] - 1:14, 146:18 **box** [4] - 23:11, 24:10, 25:22, 131:5 Brady [6] - 121:5, 121:22, 124:17, 124:18, 132:22 **brain** [4] - 28:5, 64:14, 64:16, 110:1 branch [1] - 17:19 brand [1] - 24:13 **Brann** [2] - 5:17, 5:22 Brann's [1] - 6:4 Braun [1] - 132:25 break [4] - 30:2, 74:6, 97:6, 131:4 breathe [1] - 62:10 breathing [4] - 62:10, 62:11, 64:14, 67:12 brief [4] - 6:7, 105:24, 128:21, 131:6 briefed [1] - 126:13 briefing [2] - 145:4, 145.9 briefly [2] - 87:15, 142:2 BRIER [22] - 1:16, 3:4, 6:11, 6:15, 8:8, 27:20, 71:19, 72:10, 73:24, 74:2, 102:25, 103:13, 103:19, 104:2, 104:3, 114:10, 116:13, 116:24, 117:19, 118:4, 119:12, 119:20 Brier [10] - 1:17, 6:11, 6:13, 8:7, 27:19, 72:8, 73:23, 73:24, 119:11, 119:18 bring [6] - 53:20, 93:18, 121:10, 121:14, 126:7, 126:10 broach [1] - 73:11 broad [3] - 21:13, 99:1. 123:6 brought [1] - 117:25 builds [4] - 24:5, 26:17, 110:5, 112:6 buprenorphine [3] -22:19, 22:21, 22:24 burden [4] - 122:22, 132:22, 139:4, 139:15 burdensome [1] -123:5

Bureau [2] - 18:11, 18:20 but-for [10] - 4:10, 5:12, 6:2, 33:7, 61:20, 65:6, 66:3, 66:17, 96:18, 116:15 BY [12] - 7:12, 7:18, 8:12, 13:15, 27:24, 74:2, 104:3, 114:10, 116:13, 117:3, 118:11, 146:15

C C-change [1] - 41:25 C-section [1] - 109:14 CALLED [1] - 6:20 canal [2] - 109:24, 110:1 Cancer [1] - 30:9 cancer [16] - 17:1, 55:2, 68:25, 70:8, 70:12, 70:14, 70:15, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:24, 71:2, 71:4, 93:4 cannot [7] - 85:6. 85:13, 111:14, 115:21, 115:25, 142:22, 142:24 capacity [1] - 138:21 captioned [1] - 5:17 Caputo [5] - 4:22, 5:6, 5:7, 6:4, 112:1 Caputo's [1] - 5:14 Caraballo [1] - 134:19 cardiac [3] - 25:9, 81:3, 81:10 cardiology [2] - 80:25, 81:1 Care [9] - 9:14, 10:1, 10:20, 74:24, 74:25, 75:3, 75:5, 75:7, 75:10 care [30] - 10:10, 10:11, 10:12, 18:17, 27:9, 30:17, 33:19, 37:16, 37:21, 38:6, 38:22, 54:20, 61:25, 77:19, 77:21, 77:22, 77:25, 78:5, 79:10, 79:11, 79:15, 79:17, 82:22, 83:2, 104:9, 105:7, 105:8, 112:25, 130:3, 134:11 career [4] - 31:5, 32:13, 34:11, 74:15

careful [4] - 23:13,

53:12, 55:22

Carolina [2] - 123:15, 125:9 Case [1] - 9:1 case [63] - 3:25, 4:11, 5:5, 5:11, 6:2, 30:20, 33:1, 33:11, 33:12, 35:23, 37:6, 39:21, 44:18, 44:22, 47:2, 48:10, 49:18, 50:1, 51:4, 60:1, 60:11, 61:10, 61:12, 65:7, 65:22, 65:23, 66:21, 70:5, 81:17, 81:18, 84:5, 84:11, 85:4, 88:25, 95:18, 97:10, 98:9, 102:21, 103:17, 111:18, 112:2, 119:8, 121:1, 121:6, 121:24, 121:25, 122:8, 122:17, 123:12, 123:13, 123:15, 123:16, 124:10, 124:11, 125:6, 127:18, 132:8, 132:17, 132:21, 139:18, 141:22, 144:9, 145:14 cases [23] - 6:6, 19:8, 26:10, 26:24, 27:1, 27:3, 31:8, 31:12, 31:17, 31:20, 33:8, 33:18, 64:21, 71:3, 76:16, 76:24, 88:4, 121:25, 122:2, 125:6, 140:2 CASEY [32] - 3:3, 72:22, 73:18, 126:13, 127:20, 128:3, 128:22, 129:24, 130:5, 130:12, 130:20, 130:24, 132:19, 132:21, 133:9, 133:13, 133:19, 135:1, 135:17, 137:11, 137:21, 138:9, 138:13, 138:25, 140:8, 140:10, 140:22, 140:24, 141:5, 143:4, 143:25, 145:15 Casey [7] - 1:17, 120:8, 130:22, 141:2, 141:23, 143:24, 144:20 categories [3] - 40:1, 40:4, 127:8 cater [2] - 51:11, 51:12 causation [1] - 116:15 causes [1] - 63:14 causing [2] - 44:6, 53:4 caution [1] - 23:10 cava [2] - 94:20, 97:11 caveat [1] - 134:4 CDC [14] - 21:16, 41:12, 41:14, 41:15, 41:17, 68:5, 68:7, 68:14, 68:18, 70:5, 70:11, 72:4, 87:16, 111:3 ceased [1] - 96:6 cells [1] - 97:6 Center [3] - 9:8, 9:17, 11:9 center [5] - 11:11, 11:24, 29:23, 39:16, 42:8 Centers [1] - 51:22 central [4] - 11:11, 100:7, 109:24, 110:1 century [1] - 20:19 CEO [1] - 75:14 cerebral [4] - 109:23, 109:24, 110:3, 110:4 certain [8] - 5:9, 20:2, 33:21, 35:9, 42:11, 51:9, 120:22, 123:25 certainly [9] - 56:9, 67:21, 74:8, 81:1, 97:24, 103:20, 103:21, 137:9, 144:20 certainty [2] - 71:11, 71:13 **certificate** [1] - 146:22 Certificate [2] - 16:7, 16:11 Certification [1] - 78:8 certification [4] - 4:15, 15:25, 16:2, 77:5 certifications [1] -16.14 Certified [3] - 4:16, 16:3, 77:3 certified [9] - 15:23, 15:24, 16:1, 22:10, 77:11, 77:22, 78:13, 124:22 **CERTIFIED** [1] - 1:24 certifies [1] - 77:4 certify [2] - 146:6, 146:10 **certifying** [1] - 146:23 **CFR** [6] - 44:24, 45:12, 46:25, 49:12, 71:23, 88:10 **chair** [1] - 86:5

challenge [2] - 103:4, 103:5 challenging [1] -102:20 **chance** [1] - 56:12 change [8] - 41:25, 67:25, 78:19, 89:24, 94:13, 98:24, 117:6, 118:17 **changed** [4] - 78:15, 78:16, 78:22, 78:23 changes [2] - 68:5, 94:14 changing [1] - 70:19 Chapter [3] - 48:14, 49:17, 71:22 characteristics [2] -26:10, 28:7 characterization [1] -135:19 charged [2] - 19:12, 32:5 chart [2] - 110:18, 111:3 chasm [1] - 67:4 check [1] - 103:1 chemicals [1] - 102:1 Chemistry [1] - 9:3 chest [1] - 62:12 chief [1] - 26:5 Chief [6] - 9:13, 10:19, 10:21, 10:22, 10:24, 11:12 Chou [1] - 42:6 chronic [29] - 12:10, 15:4, 15:19, 16:16, 16:20, 17:1, 17:24, 18:4, 21:24, 21:25, 22:22, 27:8, 28:19, 29:15, 51:3, 54:25, 58:1, 58:6, 68:25, 70:12, 70:13, 70:16, 70:17, 78:18, 81:19, 93:4, 105:9 Chronic [4] - 40:23, 41:23, 50:7, 72:1 chronological [1] -37.17 cigarette [1] - 58:1 Circuit [10] - 4:19, 5:13, 5:14, 121:24, 122:4, 122:14, 123:12, 125:22, 125:25, 139:18 circumstance [1] -58:16 circumstances [9] -20:2, 60:18, 61:16, 63:9, 70:24, 114:19, 124:4, 124:7, 140:16

62:23

citation [1] - 139:7 citations [2] - 99:4, 126:14 cite [8] - 99:10, 99:12, 99:15, 114:18, 122:2, 123:12, 125:6, 125:7 **cited** [4] - 6:6, 99:8, 123:15, 140:3 citing [1] - 139:17 **City** [1] - 123:14 civil [3] - 31:12, 31:17, 33:18 claim [1] - 122:18 claimed [1] - 125:11 clarification [2] - 83:5, 84:8 cleaned [1] - 131:5 cleanly [1] - 30:2 clear [5] - 38:5, 55:3, 65:12, 69:9, 101:9 clearest [2] - 89:11, 89:19 clearly [5] - 41:10, 64:23, 89:17, 90:1, 137:6 CLERK [2] - 6:22, 7:1 Cleveland [2] - 9:2, 32.11 client [1] - 142:20 clinic [3] - 12:6, 12:20, 14:8 Clinic [3] - 36:9, 113:9, 116:23 clinical [20] - 17:10, 54:5, 61:16, 76:1, 76:3, 86:17, 86:22, 87:2, 87:11, 87:12, 88:17, 88:18, 89:12, 93:1, 93:15, 93:19, 95:9, 97:2, 99:3 clinically [1] - 77:18 close [1] - 145:13 closed [2] - 62:10, 62.11 closing [1] - 62:20 **co** [1] - 65:1 co-administration [1] - 65:1 Code [13] - 43:7, 43:15, 43:20, 43:22, 44:19, 45:7, 47:10, 60:6, 71:22, 71:24, 72:2, 88:10, 146:6 code [3] - 40:16, 43:7, 43:25 codes [1] - 51:10 Colkley [5] - 121:24, 122:4, 123:11, 123:13, 123:17

colleagues [1] - 22:6 collect [2] - 140:11, 143:10 collection [2] -109:23, 110:5 college [2] - 8:24, 9:4 College [1] - 8:25 combinations [1] -67:17 comfortable [4] -128:5, 136:14, 137:25, 138:2 coming [4] - 7:25, 24:9, 72:24, 87:9 commencement [1] -3:14 commissions [1] -39.8 committed [1] -135:24 common [8] - 17:21, 29:21, 29:22, 62:13, 98:20, 102:6 commonly [2] - 27:4, 101:18 Commonwealth [10] -8:18, 18:14, 18:18, 33:22, 34:9, 40:13, 48:16, 50:9, 50:23, 79:13 communicated [1] -37:23 community [5] -21:10, 34:6, 57:15, 77:19, 79:15 community-based [2] - 77:19, 79:15 Comp [1] - 75:24 company [2] - 13:19, 13:23 compare [2] - 25:21, 28:6 compared [3] - 23:8, 28:5, 101:17 comparing [1] - 38:19 compartment [1] -97:8 compartments [1] -94:13 Compensation [3] -17:12, 75:22, 75:23 Competence [2] -16:7, 16:11 **competency** [1] - 77:9 **Competency** [1] - 78:8 **complaints** [1] - 61:23 complete 131 - 74:16. 113:19, 130:25

completed [1] - 78:5

completely [1] - 98:5

completing [1] - 9:11 complications [1] -51:25 comply [1] - 44:16 comprehensive [2] -80:19, 89:6 compresses [1] -110:6 comprise [1] - 21:8 **comprised** [1] - 50:13 computer [1] - 1:22 computer-aided [1] -1:22 computerized [1] -118:21 **CONABOY** [1] - 145:5 Conaboy [1] - 1:18 conceivable [2] -88:18, 88:19 concentrate [1] -13:22 concentrates [1] -17:6 concentrating [1] -12:10 concentration [2] -96:2, 96:9 concentrations [4] -9:2, 67:9, 96:11, 100:5 concerned [3] - 10:8, 17:20, 130:6 **concerning** [1] - 10:14 conclude [2] - 73:20, 89:14 concluded [2] - 122:4, 141:1 concluding [2] -136:19. 140:19 conclusion [1] - 63:19 conclusions [10] -5:1, 5:2, 36:25, 40:2, 44:22, 47:2, 48:9, 49:18, 51:4, 60:16 conclusory [1] -139:14 concussion [1] - 30:8 condition [5] - 15:18, 38:5, 38:9, 61:20, 82:19 conditions [2] - 10:9, 130.7 conduct [2] - 73:15, 129:4 conducted [3] - 35:15, 48:1, 53:11 **conference** [6] - 3:6, 3:14, 129:3, 131:7, 137:17, 141:1

confronted [2] -

59:15, 60:23 Connecticut [1] -129:10 connection [1] -119:19 cons [1] - 44:7 consciousness [2] -64:16, 64:18 consensus [2] -41:22, 86:17 consequence [1] -139:25 consequences [1] -123:7 consider [3] - 124:5, 136:25, 138:25 consideration [4] -65:8, 65:9, 136:21, 143:8 considered [3] -27:10, 68:15, 87:12 consistent [4] - 62:8, 68:19, 120:21, 120:22 consult [3] - 19:2, 19:16, 141:19 consultant [5] - 17:15, 17:18, 18:11, 32:1 Consultants [2] -13:24, 75:15 consultation [3] -12:6, 14:9, 38:18 consulted [1] - 17:23 contact [1] - 104:19 contacted [1] - 101:10 contained [1] - 55:1 contains [1] - 24:14 contemplating [1] -131:17 content [1] - 142:15 contention [1] -127:21 contents [1] - 97:7 contest [1] - 123:7 context [1] - 40:10 Contin [3] - 106:20, 106:22, 106:25 continue [4] - 17:10, 18:10, 72:18, 100:10 continues [3] - 28:18, 139:7, 139:13 continuous [1] -112:23 contradicting [1] -139:16 contradictory [1] -122:11 contribute [2] - 26:10, 119:8 contributory [1] -

Control [1] - 51:23 control [5] - 52:11, 55:19, 63:10, 64:11, 146:23 Controlled [10] - 16:7, 16:13, 19:13, 19:14, 40:12, 44:20, 48:15, 58:25, 72:3, 78:8 controlled [39] -16:12, 16:16, 16:17, 16:19, 18:16, 19:25, 20:1, 20:16, 20:18, 20:20, 20:23, 20:24, 21:3, 22:1, 43:17, 44:2, 44:9, 45:14, 45:18, 46:2, 46:24, 49:1, 49:4, 52:6, 52:21, 52:24, 53:13, 57:16, 57:21, 58:5, 59:7, 59:20, 67:5, 79:6, 79:8, 79:18, 79:19, 86:16, 87:2 controversial [1] -55:2 conveniently [1] -118:1 convent [1] - 30:1 conversation [1] -84:9 conversion[7] -25:10, 25:16, 29:4, 111:10, 112:4, 112:7, 114:1 conversions [1] -111:14 convert [1] - 28:22 converting [1] - 25:13 convey [1] - 92:1 conveyed [1] - 22:5 convulsants [1] -16:18 cookie [1] - 87:25 cookie-cutter [1] -87:25 copious [1] - 62:6 copy [4] - 50:21, 74:10, 74:13, 101:6 cord [11] - 14:23, 14:25, 28:5, 29:16, 29:20, 109:24, 109:25, 110:2, 110:9, 110:10 cornerstone [2] -67:1, 78:19 coroner [5] - 35:9, 61:17, 63:13, 65:12, 92.10 coroner's [2] - 92:9, 115:8

correct [200] - 7:19,
9:17, 13:17, 15:6,
17:16, 22:11, 25:6,
31:11, 43:20, 45:10,
47:9, 49:13, 49:14,
49:25, 60:13, 74:13,
74:17, 74:21, 74:22,
75:1, 75:6, 75:9,
75:11, 75:15, 75:25,
76:1, 76:4, 76:5,
76:7, 76:11, 76:12,
76:18, 76:22, 76:23,
76:25, 77:7, 77:12,
77:19, 77:23, 78:1,
78:3, 78:10, 78:11,
78:20, 78:23, 79:1,
79:5, 79:6, 79:8,
79:16, 79:23, 79:24,
80:6, 80:9, 80:11,
80:20, 80:21, 80:23,
80:24, 81:4, 81:11,
81:19, 81:22, 81:23,
81:24, 82:3, 82:6,
82:8, 82:11, 82:22,
83:8, 83:9, 84:4,
84:13, 84:14, 84:22,
85:19, 85:21, 85:22,
86:6, 86:20, 86:22,
87:9, 87:13, 87:14,
87:17, 87:18, 87:21,
88:1, 88:7, 88:13,
88:18, 89:1, 89:3,
89:4, 89:8, 89:12,
89:20, 90:3, 90:18,
90:22, 91:2, 91:3,
91:9, 91:10, 91:11,
91:18, 91:22, 92:1,
92:3, 92:15, 92:16,
92:18, 92:23, 93:7,
93:11, 93:14, 93:18,
93:21, 94:3, 94:4,
94:5, 94:8, 94:9,
94:11, 94:15, 94:16,
94:17, 94:18, 94:23,
95:3, 95:19, 97:1,
97:13, 98:2, 98:6,
98:12, 99:11, 99:14,
99:25, 100:3, 100:8,
100:13, 101:2,
101:20, 102:1,
102:5, 102:9,
102:12, 102:15,
103:17, 104:18,
100.17, 104.10,
104:23, 105:9,
105:18, 105:21,
106:12, 106:13,
100.15, 100.10,
106:15, 106:18,
106:21, 106:23,
107:11, 107:16,
108:5, 108:10,
108:14, 108:16,

108:25, 109:1, 109:8, 109:11, 109:12, 109:14, 109:15, 110:9, 110:22, 110:23, 111:1, 111:4, 111:23, 111:25, 112:9, 112:11, 112:15, 112:16, 112:18, 114:12, 115:16, 116:16, 116:17, 117:18, 119:20, 127:20, 128:3, 129:18, 146:7 correctly [6] - 78:9, 86:18, 92:11,
101:12, 101:19, 104:10
corresponding [3] - 45:19, 46:3, 49:5 Cosmetics [1] - 48:15 counsel [12] - 7:6, 7:8, 44:7, 72:20, 74:9, 117:15, 119:22, 120:2, 136:23, 137:24, 141:18, 145:17
count [4] - 53:16, 53:21, 115:23, 116:2
counting [1] - 53:18
counts [1] - 58:13
County [3] - 32:2,
32:3, 32:10 couple [2] - 25:4, 132:4
course [48] - 4:6, 5:10, 5:25, 10:10, 10:18, 11:1, 11:6, 14:1, 16:1, 19:10, 23:6, 32:6, 33:4, 33:16, 33:24, 38:2, 38:16, 39:2, 39:11, 39:14, 40:8, 40:19, 42:19, 45:5, 45:16, 45:22, 47:25, 49:3, 52:4, 52:15, 56:11, 57:12, 63:21, 65:4, 65:24, 67:22, 69:11, 74:15, 90:23, 93:23, 113:16, 117:11, 121:16, 124:7, 130:19, 135:11, 136:2, 136:3 COURT [74] - 1:1, 3:1, 3:5, 3:21, 6:10, 6:13, 6:17, 7:7, 7:10, 7:17, 8:7, 8:9, 27:17,
27:19, 27:21, 71:18, 72:8, 72:11, 72:18,

```
72:20, 73:15, 73:19,
 102:17, 103:12,
 103:16, 103:20,
 114:9, 116:5,
 116:12, 116:25,
 118:6, 119:11,
 119:13, 119:15,
 119:18, 119:21,
 120:5, 127:16,
 127:21, 128:4,
 129:2, 129:15,
 129:25, 130:3,
 130:10, 130:19,
 130:22, 130:25,
 131:4, 131:8,
 132:20, 133:8,
 133:12, 133:14,
 134:20, 136:11,
 136:14, 137:13,
 139:1, 140:15,
 140:23, 141:2,
 141:9, 141:13,
 141:18, 143:13,
 143:17, 144:11,
 144:20, 144:23.
 145:1, 145:7,
 145:12, 145:17
court [6] - 7:25, 24:9,
 75:20, 76:14, 76:20,
 140.20
Court [57] - 7:5, 14:18,
 31:10, 32:22, 33:11,
 37:9, 66:24, 73:2,
 73:8, 73:11, 97:4,
 99:14, 120:22,
 122:21, 123:9,
 123:16, 123:17,
 124:2, 125:10,
 125:15, 125:23,
 125:25, 126:5,
 126:15, 126:16,
 126:17, 127:4,
 127:6, 130:12,
 130:13, 133:11,
 134:15, 134:22,
 136:8, 136:9,
 136:10, 137:23,
 137:25, 138:1,
 138:8, 138:11,
 138:12, 138:15,
 138:16, 138:25,
 140:10, 140:12,
 143:11, 143:25,
 144:8, 144:9, 146:3,
 146:4, 146:14,
 146:17, 146:17
Court's [5] - 128:23,
 138:3, 142:2, 143:8,
 143:11
courtroom [2] - 4:12,
 111:23
```

Courts [1] - 4:18 courts [2] - 31:3, 125:18 coverage [1] - 14:11 covered [1] - 74:21 covering [3] - 11:20, 48:3, 48:4 Coyer [5] - 84:11, 100:15, 100:23, 101:21, 102:3 Coyer's [1] - 101:15 cream [1] - 106:21 credential [2] - 77:12, 78:14 credibility [6] -102:23, 114:7, 116:9, 116:10, 117:23, 128:12 crime [4] - 125:17, 125:20, 135:24, 135:25 criminal [4] - 31:7, 31:20, 76:17, 76:21 Critical [9] - 9:14, 10:1, 10:20, 74:24, 74:25, 75:3, 75:5, 75:7, 75:10 critical [3] - 10:10, 25:12, 90:9 criticism [1] - 90:14 cross [5] - 73:23, 128:8, 130:17, 130:20, 131:18 CROSS [1] - 74:1 cross-examine [2] -73:23, 130:20 cross-examined [1] -130:17 CRR [1] - 1:23 culpable [1] - 139:10 current [8] - 8:3, 37:22, 44:17, 74:13, 75:17, 76:1, 76:24, 78:24 curriculum [11] - 7:24, 8:1, 8:3, 8:14, 17:14, 19:1, 20:15, 22:9, 31:25, 74:10, 74:13 cut [1] - 62:5 cutter [1] - 87:25 cutting [1] - 70:18 Cuyahoga [3] - 32:1, 32:3, 32:10 cyst [1] - 109:21 D

D.O.'s [1] - 18:23 **dad** [1] - 67:2 **daily** [4] - 14:8, 27:2,

97:20, 98:16 Dame [35] - 3:24, 4:9, 33:15, 34:16, 34:20, 35:13, 35:16, 35:24, 36:7, 36:14, 41:4, 41:13, 58:17, 60:13, 61:15. 61:21. 63:2. 63:21. 65:11. 81:19. 96:2, 104:9, 105:18, 107:10, 108:4, 108:24, 109:17, 112:14, 112:22, 112:24, 114:20, 115:24, 116:15, 116:22, 119:6 Dame's [4] - 4:1, 35:6, 60:13, 115:12 dangerous [1] - 60:4 dangle [2] - 67:3, 93:10 Darby [1] - 139:7 Data [4] - 110:13, 117:16, 118:12, 118:19 data [11] - 5:2, 22:14, 38:18, 51:15, 51:18, 55:24. 60:17. 101:16, 105:25, 114:14, 133:25 **DATA**[3] - 22:10, 22:17, 22:20 database [1] - 59:1 date [6] - 8:3, 92:20, 101:2, 106:7, 108:2, 146:9 dated [7] - 79:22, 100:22, 104:10, 105:6, 109:6, 112:13 dates [2] - 92:22, 146:9 Daubert [12] - 1:9, 72:15, 73:20, 102:19, 102:24, 118:8, 119:17, 119:19, 119:22, 120:1, 145:3, 145:9 days [11] - 26:18, 107:15, 113:11, 113:14, 113:16, 114:5, 143:7, 144:21, 144:24, 145:6, 145:11 Dayton [1] - 11:9 **de** [1] - 26:25 **DEA** [2] - 35:15, 121:4 DEA-6's [4] - 134:15, 134:16, 141:13, 141:15

dead [5] - 62:1, 85:12,

85:21, 94:10, 97:9

deal [2] - 18:4, 93:21 dealer [1] - 125:5 dealing [2] - 12:11, 70:23 dealt [1] - 137:9 death [45] - 3:24, 4:2, 4:10, 5:12, 6:2, 32:16, 33:7, 35:3, 35:6, 35:10, 36:18, 36:21, 56:12, 61:6, 61:8, 61:12, 61:16, 61:19, 62:2, 62:21, 62:23, 64:22, 64:23, 65:6, 65:11, 65:15, 65:16, 66:3, 66:17, 66:22, 69:10, 69:18, 80:5, 80:8, 80:19, 80:22, 85:14, 85:16, 94:13, 95:24, 96:2, 98:21, 99:21, 100:2, Death [1] - 81:9 deaths [6] - 25:9, 52:6, 62:9, 80:11, 93:24, 98:18 decade [1] - 52:4 decided [3] - 13:21, 14:2, 144:6 decision [16] - 46:9, 124:3, 124:6, 124:14, 126:18, 126:19, 134:18, 134:23, 136:19, 140:2, 141:19, 142:2, 142:19, 142:22, 144:2, 144:15 decision-making [1] -46:9 decisions [4] - 6:4, 6:5, 37:25, 38:1 declaration [2] - 42:2, 51:22 declarations 131 -133:5, 138:10, 141:5 decrease [1] - 55:8 dedicated [1] - 86:10 deemed [3] - 32:23, 68:23, 87:8 **Defendant** [36] - 1:7, 3:8, 4:5, 4:10, 4:24, 5:20, 31:18, 31:21, 32:8, 34:24, 35:13, 35:18, 37:24, 38:4, 38:7, 65:24, 122:5, 122:9, 122:13, 124:24, 125:11, 125:14, 125:22, 126:3, 127:21,

129:11, 131:10,

132:1, 139:3, 139:4, 139:8, 139:15, 142:4, 142:12, 143:19 DEFENDANT[1] -1:16 Defendant's [1] -142:10 Defendants [1] -76:17 **Defender's** [1] - 32:2 Defense [20] - 4:23, 5:18, 7:6, 31:23, 32:9, 117:5, 117:15, 120:20, 121:3, 121:10, 124:11, 124:21, 126:4, 126:20, 127:4, 127:5, 132:22, 135:2, 145:10, 145:15 defer [1] - 97:13 deferred [1] - 120:1 define [1] - 48:18 defined [2] - 33:25, 47:23 defines [2] - 47:18, 49:12 defining [2] - 71:24, 72:2 **definition** [1] - 49:19 definitional [4] -47:17, 48:5, 49:8, 51:9 definitions [1] - 34:2 degenerative [2] -29:24, 30:3 degree [4] - 9:1, 64:19, 71:11, 71:13 Delaware [5] - 18:15, 31:11, 120:14, 133:5, 138:14 deliberately [1] - 67:6 deliver [1] - 14:22 delivery [1] - 10:13 Delivery [1] - 75:11 demand [1] - 13:3 demonstrate [1] - 77:9 demonstrated [1] -65:4 **Dennis** [1] - 132:25 dentists [1] - 17:24 denying [1] - 5:22 department [3] -10:24, 11:1, 75:4 Department [12] -

9:14, 10:20, 18:11,

18:19, 19:7, 19:17,

58:15, 66:10, 75:4,

83:20, 108:9, 108:13

deviations [1] - 20:13

depressants [2] devices [2] - 14:22, 82:3, 82:13 14:24 depression [3] - 26:5, **Devices** [1] - 48:15 26:7. 58:2 devote [1] - 13:8 Derr [16] - 73:3, diabetes [1] - 30:5 121:11, 122:19, diagnoses [2] - 38:12, 126:9, 127:18, 38:13 127:22, 128:5, diagnosis [9] - 16:25, 128:18, 128:24, 57:8, 60:19, 60:22, 130:9, 130:15, 60:25, 61:5, 61:10, 131:1, 131:19, 61:18, 110:11 135:10, 141:16, diagnostic [1] - 38:18 144:4 diazepam [2] - 63:16, **Derr's** [1] - 128:8 63:23 describe [3] - 20:8, die [3] - 70:22, 99:19, 20:13, 70:15 99:20 described [5] - 20:6, died [6] - 62:7, 63:13, 30:23, 31:1, 41:8, 63:22, 93:8, 96:11, 42:24 97:16 describes [1] - 40:12 difference [8] - 70:15, description [2] - 45:4, 70:22, 90:14, 95:4, 122:11 95:16, 97:17, 115:5, descriptions [1] - 41:5 121:12 descriptive [1] - 42:11 differences [1] desire [2] - 90:6 111:15 Desk [1] - 25:2 different [21] - 23:18, desk [1] - 59:4 24:2, 28:6, 28:7, detail [3] - 42:23, 92:5, 33:18, 39:25, 40:4, 122:24 70:13, 70:20, 70:25, 71:6, 94:10, 95:21, **details** [1] - 108:20 96:4, 112:11, detective [1] - 125:12 124:15, 125:4, determinant [1] - 95:8 125:13, 136:23 determination [19] -38:23, 39:13, 39:19, differential [5] - 60:19, 60:22, 60:25, 61:5, 42:18, 52:18, 57:1, 61:10 95:8, 97:15, 98:25, differs [1] - 23:17 123:4, 124:25, difficult [1] - 130:6 128:11, 131:23, difficulties [1] - 55:18 132:6, 133:18, 137:1, 137:13, difficulty [1] - 51:6 137:20, 139:22 diminish [1] - 15:10 determine [13] -**Diplomate** [1] - 4:14 37:18, 37:21, 52:20, **DIRECT** [1] - 7:11 52:23, 53:4, 53:20, direct [26] - 24:17, 56:17, 57:22, 61:6, 37:15, 43:12, 47:5, 128:7, 128:13, 48:12, 49:20, 58:18, 133:16, 136:9 58:19, 58:23, 72:16, determined [3] -74:12, 74:23, 75:13, 38:20, 63:13, 96:18 76:13, 78:7, 80:13, determining [8] -81:7, 87:3, 87:15, 38:2, 38:14, 46:10, 87:22, 88:3, 89:1, 57:1, 61:19, 95:23, 115:10, 116:14, 124:5, 132:2 130:20, 146:23 detoxification [3] directed [1] - 118:1 106:3, 118:24, 119:3 directing [2] - 25:4, develop [1] - 98:10 117:14 **developed** [1] - 11:10 direction [3] - 48:13, **develops** [1] - 60:23 88:20, 98:23 deviate [1] - 140:1

directives [1] - 69:25 directly [5] - 14:22, 42:17, 59:4, 62:23, 134:8 disability [1] - 75:24 Disability [2] - 13:23, 75.14 disabled [3] - 73:1, 127:12, 138:22 Discharge [1] - 11:17 disciplinary [1] - 12:9 disciplines [1] - 9:21 discourage [1] - 123:8 discuss [3] - 71:3, 72:21, 145:13 discussed [2] - 3:14, 132:10 discussing [1] - 66:25 discussion [1] -137:18 **Discussion** [1] - 141:1 Disease [1] - 51:22 disease [3] - 22:22, 29:24, 30:3 diseases [1] - 58:1 diskette [1] - 23:15 disorder [2] - 56:23, 58.2 dispenses [1] - 49:6 dispensing [4] -40:17, 43:16, 45:18, 60.7 Dispensing [2] -44:20, 72:3 dispose [1] - 129:7 disregard [7] - 120:17, 123:18. 126:24. 134:7, 136:7, 142:6, 142:12 dissimilar [1] - 67:17 distinguish [1] - 16:23 distract [1] - 123:3 distribution [3] -23:16, 94:13, 94:14 District [11] - 4:21, 76:25, 123:15, 125:9, 125:10, 125:15, 125:23, 146:4, 146:17, 146:18 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 district [1] - 5:17 Diversion [2] - 73:3, 144:4 divide [1] - 12:22 divided [2] - 12:23, 23:19 division [1] - 10:2 directions [2] - 44:15, Doctor [46] - 18:21, 49:7 19:1, 74:3, 74:12,

74:19, 78:7, 78:22, 80:10, 80:17, 81:14, 84:5, 84:9, 84:20, 84:24, 85:4, 85:23, 86:8, 89:5, 89:10, 89:17, 91:11, 94:1, 94:25, 95:15, 97:3, 97:4, 98:14, 99:11, 99:23, 100:17, 100:20, 101:2, 101:5, 103:11, 103:14, 104:6, 104:17, 104:21, 108:12, 109:16, 109:20, 110:17, 112:20, 114:11, 115:11, 116:14 doctor [48] - 25:2, 27:12, 29:12, 30:25, 31:1, 34:4, 37:23, 42:15, 56:19, 60:18, 74:9, 75:13, 75:17, 79:21, 82:1, 83:10, 86:13, 87:15, 88:25, 89:25, 90:9, 92:8, 92:25, 95:1, 97:18, 99:4, 100:12, 100:22, 104:4, 104:12, 104:25, 106:5, 107:4, 107:13, 107:25, 108:18, 109:5, 110:12, 110:25, 111:18, 112:13, 115:7, 125:4, 133:2, 135:5, 135:11, 135:13 doctor's [1] - 141:8 Doctor's [1] - 90:11 doctor-patient [2] -34:4, 133:2 doctors [2] - 18:22, 106:12 Doctrine [1] - 123:10 document [1] - 40:23 documentation [6] -104:8, 104:12, 104:23, 110:17, 110:19, 114:18 documented [2] -55:10, 61:21 documents [3] - 99:7, 108:9, 108:12 Dolophine [2] - 24:14, 24.21 dominates [1] - 144:1 done [17] - 19:19, 44:14, 76:14, 83:10, 83:12, 83:13, 91:5, 115:23, 129:21,

130:15, 137:16, 140:21, 142:23, 143:7, 143:20, 144:6 dosage [1] - 25:13 dose [26] - 13:6, 13:12, 25:17, 25:18, 25:19, 25:21, 26:12, 26:17, 28:18, 28:20, 29:1, 52:1, 52:2, 53:5, 55:10, 55:14, 68:18, 68:19, 99:6, 107:1, 108:22, 111:14, 113:10, 114:4, 114:12, 114:15 doses [14] - 27:2, 53:24, 53:25, 56:4, 56:5, 56:7, 56:9, 58:9, 58:10, 63:6, 98:19, 112:7, 112:8, 133:25 dosing [3] - 26:9, 115:5, 117:8 double [2] - 87:2, 87:11 double-blind [2] -87:2, 87:11 doubt [1] - 123:23 down [10] - 30:2, 84:13, 97:6, 101:16, 107:18, 108:12, 113:14, 119:1, 119:13, 135:14 doxepin [1] - 62:22 dozens [1] - 127:7 Dr [97] - 3:10, 3:16, 3:23, 3:24, 4:12, 4:17, 4:20, 4:23, 4:25, 5:1, 5:4, 5:7, 5:9, 5:15, 5:19, 5:24, 6:8, 6:12, 6:19, 7:4, 7:13, 7:19, 8:13, 12:15, 15:23, 17:8, 26:13, 42:6, 52:13, 61:25, 63:4, 63:5, 63:16, 67:25, 71:8, 71:16, 72:5, 72:17, 73:17, 73:18, 73:25, 79:15, 84:11, 84:16, 90:9, 90:14, 92:11, 92:13, 92:20, 97:13, 99:17, 100:15, 100:23, 101:15, 101:21, 102:3, 104:9, 104:16, 105:4, 105:11, 105:13, 105:17, 105:18, 105:23, 106:7, 107:10,

108:4, 108:13,

110:18, 111:18, 111:19, 111:20, 112:24, 112:25, 113:4, 113:8, 113:11, 114:7, 115:9, 115:13, 116:9, 116:11, 116:19, 117:4, 118:1, 118:22, 119:13, 121:15, 124:14, 124:19, 124:22, 126:11, 134:11, 135:13 dr [1] - 118:12 **Dr.Stephen** [1] - 1:9 draw [5] - 67:22, 85:12, 95:19, 95:20 drawn [8] - 94:19, 94:20, 94:21, 96:7, 97:9, 97:10, 97:12 drew [2] - 85:4, 95:2 drive [1] - 138:21 drop [1] - 42:3 Drug [7] - 19:3, 22:14, 35:24, 58:18, 58:20, 58:24, 135:9 drug [68] - 12:11, 23:21, 23:22, 24:1, 24:2, 24:8, 27:14, 44:15, 49:10, 53:3, 53:4, 53:6, 53:7, 53:9, 53:12, 53:14, 54:2, 54:6, 54:7, 54:8, 54:9, 54:10, 54:11, 54:12, 54:13, 55:7, 55:10, 55:20, 56:20, 56:22, 57:9, 58:6, 58:7, 58:13, 58:14, 58:24, 62:18, 63:8, 63:14, 63:16, 65:13, 65:14, 69:18, 69:21, 80:5, 93:16, 95:11, 95:13, 95:17, 95:24, 96:11, 96:25, 97:16, 97:21, 98:5, 98:8, 98:9, 98:10, 100:10, 102:6, 110:15, 110:19, 110:24, 118:15, 118:22, 125:5 drug" [1] - 56:24 drug-liking [1] - 56:20 drug-seeking [1] -54:2 drugs [30] - 16:19, 18:1, 19:24, 23:19, 28:6, 38:11, 44:17, 51:25, 53:17, 53:23, 53:24, 54:8, 54:15,

108:24, 109:17,

55:3, 55:6, 55:13, 55:25, 59:10, 62:24, 63:11, 63:12, 64:8, 66:25, 67:13, 78:15, 94:14, 101:9, 101:18, 134:10 **Drugs** [1] - 48:15 due [3] - 29:15, 97:12, 139:25 **DULY** [1] - 6:21 dump [2] - 25:22, 110:4 duration [1] - 70:21 during [26] - 7:4, 10:10, 10:11, 10:21, 10:22, 11:1, 11:5, 12:5, 14:7, 25:9, 25:15, 25:16, 25:17, 26:11, 28:15, 28:20, 41:1, 74:15, 74:23, 75:8, 77:17, 83:15, 86:9, 98:21, 112:22, 117:10 duties [1] - 123:3 duty [7] - 11:5, 11:7, 18:2, 20:6, 20:7, 123:6, 124:10 **dying** [1] - 70:8 dynamically [1] -23:23 dysfunction [1] - 62:3

E

E2 [1] - 47:13 earliest [1] - 104:8 early [4] - 26:9, 104:15, 104:20, 112:25 Eastern [1] - 125:9 economy [1] - 129:4 edema [1] - 62:6 editorial [1] - 91:13 education [3] - 8:23, 8:24, 46:22 effect [6] - 26:2, 44:13, 55:4, 55:8, 94:22, 94:24 effective [3] - 44:16, 45:15, 55:3 effectiveness [3] -52:25, 69:1, 107:22 effects [5] - 26:2, 26:7, 26:8, 64:17, 95:12 efficacy [1] - 69:5 efficiency [1] - 144:2 efficient [1] - 144:5 efficiently [1] - 129:20 eight [5] - 12:16,

22:20, 29:1, 29:2, 115:1 either [9] - 6:4, 14:21, 18:22, 37:15, 54:13, 54:17, 85:25, 119:22, 144:6 elderly [1] - 127:12 electrical [1] - 14:24 electrocuted [1] -29:18 **eliminated** [1] - 24:6 elucidate [1] - 21:4 Emergency [2] -108:9, 108:13 encourage [1] - 42:11 encouraged [1] -41:21 end [4] - 46:8, 70:23, 117:12, 135:13 endeavor [1] - 56:13 endocrinopathies [1] - 69:19 Enforcement [1] -135:9 enforcement [7] -21:3, 21:7, 21:15, 122:23, 123:21, 124:10, 124:16 engage [1] - 20:5 engaged [1] - 76:6 English [1] - 112:22 enhance [2] - 64:17, 64:23 entire [2] - 34:11, 135:5 entirely [1] - 140:6 entirety [1] - 61:18 entitle [2] - 131:10, 142:20 entitled [4] - 131:13, 131:14, 137:3, 140:16 entries [1] - 37:15 entry [1] - 91:4 environment [1] - 97:8 enzymatic [1] - 97:7 epidemic [5] - 21:17, 21:18, 21:21, 42:3, 51:24 epitome [1] - 136:6 equate [1] - 124:17 equating [1] - 28:11 equivalates [1] - 97:8 equivalence [4] -68:22, 69:5, 69:8, 111.11 equivalencies [2] -69:12, 69:15

equivalency [2] -

111:1, 111:10

139:19

factor [2] - 28:22, 29:4

Equivalency [1] -68.11 equivalent [4] - 28:15, 28:17, 28:25, 29:5 Equivalents [4] -27:25, 28:2, 68:10, 68:15 equivalents [4] -28:23, 29:6, 56:8, 56:10 error [1] - 139:24 especially [4] - 23:12, 64:10, 66:21, 87:11 Esq [4] - 1:13, 1:17, 1:17, 1:18 essentially [1] - 63:8 establish [4] - 105:7, 105:8, 141:7, 142:15 established [4] -78:13, 123:24, 139:23, 142:12 establishes [1] -120:9 estimate [4] - 94:24, 95:5, 95:25, 112:12 estimates [1] - 111:14 evaluate [7] - 33:14, 34:8, 40:14, 44:3, 44:4, 71:6, 126:17 evaluated [1] - 33:17 evaluating [3] - 40:10, 61:11. 75:25 evaluation [14] -14:14, 16:5, 16:25, 17:11, 17:23, 18:13, 18:15, 19:23, 20:3, 38:10, 41:16, 42:7, 58:17, 143:11 evaluations [2] -75:23, 75:24 event [3] - 87:21, 96:15, 142:11 events [3] - 3:24, 4:1, 89:20 **EVERS**[1] - 1:6 Evers [35] - 3:6, 6:12, 34:24, 63:4, 63:5, 63:16, 66:10, 73:25, 79:15, 90:9, 90:14, 99:17, 104:9, 104:16. 105:11. 105:13, 105:17, 105:18, 105:23, 106:7, 108:4, 108:13, 112:24, 113:4, 113:8, 113:11, 115:13, 116:19, 118:22, 121:15, 124:14, 124:19, 126:11,

135:13, 135:24 Evers' [10] - 61:25, 92:11, 92:20, 107:10, 108:24, 109:17, 110:18, 112:25, 115:9, 134:11 Evers's [1] - 92:13 evidence [42] - 3:7, 6:16. 8:11. 27:23. 39:1, 54:9, 54:12, 55:3, 68:25, 69:3, 72:14, 80:15, 84:14, 86:13, 86:14, 86:15, 86:16, 86:20, 87:5, 87:6, 87:8, 87:9, 87:12, 87:13, 99:8, 99:16, 103:8, 111:7, 114:17, 120:15, 122:16, 122:17, 123:1, 123:19, 125:24, 126:2, 127:6, 133:9, 133:11, 138:7, 138:25, 142:13 evidence-based [7] -80:15, 86:13, 86:14, 86:20, 99:8, 99:16, 114:17 evidentiary [3] -126:16, 142:22, 142:25 evolved [1] - 87:24 exactly [6] - 24:25, 89:16, 92:17, 95:4, 117:23, 130:24 exam [1] - 85:5 EXAMINATION[3] -7:11, 74:1, 117:2 examination [23] -38:18, 48:2, 52:23, 57:3, 57:8, 62:25, 63:18, 74:12, 74:23, 75:13, 76:13, 78:7, 80:13, 81:7, 87:15, 89:1, 115:11, 116:14, 128:9, 130:25, 131:19, 135:12, 144:7 examinations [2] -17:9, 86:10 examine [2] - 73:23, 130:20 examined [1] - 130:17 examinees [1] - 17:11 Examiner [3] - 4:16, 16:4, 77:4 examiner [2] - 77:14, 77:15

Examiners [2] - 16:5,

example [8] - 40:21, 53:5, 80:4, 82:12, 92:19, 102:3, 132:24, 135:7 exceeding [1] - 68:16 exceedingly [2] -59:17, 70:20 excellence [1] - 10:24 except [1] - 37:11 **exception** [2] - 73:6, 79:25 **excessive**[1] - 108:14 excised [1] - 127:25 Exclude [1] - 3:9 exclude [2] - 4:23, 71:5 excluded [2] - 123:1, 142:16 **exclusively** [1] - 13:16 exculpatory [8] -121:3, 122:16, 123:1, 123:19, 123:20, 123:22, 125:24, 126:2 Excuse [1] - 13:10 executed [1] - 121:1 execution [1] - 121:9 exhaust [1] - 123:22 Exhibit [36] - 7:21, 7:23, 8:6, 8:10, 24:18, 24:19, 25:5, 27:11, 27:16, 27:22, 43:13, 44:25, 47:1, 47:6, 48:9, 48:13, 48:14, 48:22, 49:21, 50:3, 66:5, 66:8, 66:11, 68:8, 69:22, 70:2, 71:15, 71:21, 71:23, 71:24, 72:1, 72:4, 72:6, 72:13, 111:8 exhibit [5] - 24:20, 64:11, 68:8, 71:22, 111:6 Exhibits [1] - 66:6 exhibits [2] - 7:3, 72:9 **expansion** [1] - 21:13 expect [3] - 53:6, 113:22, 128:18 **expectancy** [1] - 52:5 expected [10] - 38:15, 39:8, 40:18, 53:3, 54:7, 54:13, 55:8, 55:11, 59:12, 126:1 experience [13] -29:10, 29:13, 30:25, 38:11, 51:16, 59:15, 65:7, 66:19, 66:20, 67:13, 67:17, 88:6,

77:5

93:15 experimentation [1] -51:16 expert [32] - 3:23, 3:25. 4:3. 4:17. 4:20. 5:8, 5:15, 5:24, 17:15, 30:20, 30:22, 31:4, 31:7, 31:12, 32:4, 32:13, 32:19, 33:1, 42:25, 43:2, 73:5, 76:15, 79:4, 86:17, 91:25, 102:21, 103:2, 107:7, 108:6, 109:17, 117:20 expert's [1] - 103:6 explain [8] - 14:18, 37:8, 46:4, 61:14, 66:24, 97:4, 109:22, 112:20 explained [1] - 135:10 expressed [2] - 71:9, 71.12 expression [1] -128:23 expressly [1] - 90:9 extended [1] - 134:1 extensive [2] - 101:17, 129:5 extent [6] - 37:20, 39:7, 51:14, 63:6, 137:8, 142:17 extraordinary [1] -122:22 eye [1] - 125:10 eyewitnesses [1] -122:9

F

F2d [1] - 123:12 F3d [1] - 125:21 face [2] - 56:12, 142:17 facet [1] - 144:1 facets [1] - 126:25 fact [37] - 21:20, 28:2, 34:10, 34:13, 41:6, 44:19, 56:7, 58:11, 58:12, 59:3, 59:9, 60:5, 62:14, 64:20, 67:18, 71:3, 76:24, 84:5, 85:14, 88:4, 89:10, 92:1, 93:9, 95:9, 97:22, 98:20, 103:7, 110:23, 111:25, 113:8, 115:6, 116:1, 118:19, 124:21, 126:16, 131:24,

factors [3] - 55:19, 63:11. 111:10 facts [2] - 5:2, 103:21 failed [2] - 99:15, 122:5 fails [1] - 54:12 failure [1] - 123:19 fair [2] - 77:10, 91:17 fairly [2] - 29:14, 61:3 faith [1] - 34:3 fall [2] - 52:5, 118:23 falls [3] - 64:25, 69:19, 108:23 false [21] - 120:15, 120:17, 126:5, 127:24, 128:11, 131:22, 132:14, 133:3, 133:9, 134:7, 134:11, 134:12, 136:7, 139:5, 139:9, 142:5, 142:8, 142:14, 144:18 falsely [1] - 134:10 falsifications [1] -138:17 familiar [13] - 21:18, 25:5, 43:15, 44:24, 47:6, 48:14, 54:20, 60:19, 68:17, 79:3, 84:20, 84:24, 85:23 families [3] - 73:1, 127:12, 143:9 far [3] - 39:15, 42:20, 140:19 fashion [2] - 22:23, 56:22 **fashioned** [1] - 9:21 fatal [2] - 99:6, 100:6 FDA [3] - 22:18, 23:11, February [1] - 109:6 Federal [10] - 4:18, 19:14, 19:15, 23:3, 31:10, 32:2, 45:7, 49:15, 51:10, 139:18 Federation [6] - 40:22, 41:7, 50:6, 50:12, 50:16, 60:9 Fellow [2] - 16:2, 74:20 **fellowship** [1] - 10:22 Fellowship [2] - 9:12, 84:2 femoral [3] - 85:6, 85:9, 94:21 fentanyl [4] - 100:13, 102:4, 102:8, 102:15 few [3] - 72:22, 117:1,

119:1 file [4] - 34:24, 34:25, 56:2, 104:15 filed [5] - 3:8, 124:21, 124:24, 133:8, 134:13 files [2] - 133:22, 133:25 **fills** [1] - 45:20 final [1] - 61:18 finder [2] - 126:16, 126:17 findings [3] - 85:8, 101:9, 101:10 fine [6] - 67:11, 131:3, 137:13, 140:9, 140:18, 145:1 fire [1] - 59:18 firearm [2] - 125:11, 125:14 First [2] - 36:6, 112:25 first [45] - 3:9, 4:25, 6:17, 8:14, 8:23, 11:10, 11:17, 24:7, 25:4, 25:8, 28:14, 28:16, 34:20, 34:22, 36:8, 38:19, 38:23, 40:5, 40:24, 45:11, 52:12, 60:2, 60:24, 66:7, 82:13, 88:8, 90:11, 90:22, 92:2, 94:7, 98:2, 98:5, 104:6, 104:14, 104:16, 107:18, 109:3, 109:19, 110:12, 110:21, 120:8, 135:7, 142:23, 144:9 first-time [2] - 98:2, fit [2] - 102:21, 127:15 fitness [1] - 18:2 five [4] - 26:18, 69:11, 113:9, 131:5 **flag** [1] - 59:18 flows [1] - 110:3 fluid [8] - 62:6, 62:8, 62:13, 109:23, 109:25, 110:3, 110:4, 110:6 flux [1] - 96:9 focus [3] - 82:8, 126:5, 127:17 focused [1] - 20:16 folks [1] - 89:7 follow [9] - 37:5, 38:21, 38:22, 38:25, 73:5, 73:18, 122:23, 129:1, 130:23 followed [2] - 9:8,

39:6 following [1] - 131:7 FOLLOWS [1] - 6:21 food [1] - 25:21 foot [1] - 70:18 footnote [1] - 101:15 footnoted [2] - 91:16, 91.24 FOR [3] - 1:1, 1:12, 1:16 force [1] - 103:14 Force [6] - 11:5, 11:7, 11:9, 11:11, 19:3 foregoing [3] - 146:7, 146:10, 146:22 forensic [2] - 84:17, 84:18 forever [1] - 30:1 forgive [1] - 86:18 form [6] - 13:19, 52:23, 86:6, 115:8, 115:9 formed [1] - 13:23 former [1] - 16:2 forming [1] - 91:22 forms [1] - 22:19 forth [1] - 146:9 forward [3] - 74:6, 132:13, 136:24 foul [1] - 135:21 foundation [5] - 89:8, 90:3, 103:3, 103:9 foundations [2] -91:8, 103:1 four [12] - 10:23, 11:6, 11:13, 11:15, 12:4, 17:11, 28:19, 113:11, 113:13, 114:4, 125:10, 125:12 Fourth [8] - 121:24, 122:4, 122:14, 122:15, 123:10, 123:12, 129:3, 142:9 fractures [2] - 69:19, 118:23 fragmented [1] - 37:22

frame [2] - 117:10,

Frank [1] - 1:17

68:3, 134:17

frankly [3] - 67:13,

Franks [50] - 72:24,

120:14, 121:2,

121:23, 122:3,

125:16, 125:23,

126:13, 127:17,

128:16, 131:9,

73:5, 120:7, 120:13,

frank [2] - 6:11, 73:24

117:12

131:13, 131:18, 131:24, 131:25, 132:2, 132:8, 132:16, 132:18, 133:4, 133:11, 133:16, 134:23, 137:3, 137:6, 138:7, 138:8, 138:13, 139:19, 139:23, 140:2, 141:3, 141:19, 141:21, 141:25, 142:1, 142:2, 142:19, 142:20, 142:21, 142:25, 143:18, 144:1, 144:6, 144:11, 144:18 fraud [1] - 20:4 free [1] - 63:8 frequently [4] - 54:4, 56:15, 70:21, 82:24 front [10] - 7:3, 7:19, 24:18, 43:13, 47:9, 61:2, 74:10, 90:16, 100:18, 104:25 frothiness [1] - 62:5 fruits [2] - 135:25, 142:16 Fuhai [1] - 4:22 fulfilling [1] - 45:24 full [2] - 104:6, 115:20 fulsome [2] - 38:8, 138:16 function [9] - 12:10, 12:11, 15:11, 15:16, 55:9, 68:20, 69:6, 98:12, 98:16 functioning [1] -14:10 functions [1] - 97:20 fundamentals [1] -70:13 futile [1] - 122:25

G

gain [2] - 51:15, 58:19 gained [1] - 57:9 gains [1] - 57:5 garnering [1] - 15:8 gathered [1] - 52:22 Geisinger [1] - 36:14 general [8] - 10:3, 23:16, 88:16, 88:20, 88:22, 93:12, 93:13, 115:1 General's [1] - 19:2 generalist [1] - 10:14 generally [3] - 25:20, 57:18, 63:25 generated [2] - 21:16, 109:25 genetics [1] - 111:15 geriatric [1] - 10:2 given [18] - 61:1, 62:25, 63:20, 64:5, 87:6, 90:7, 95:9, 96:10, 101:10, 116:21, 116:22, 124:3, 128:23, 132:1, 133:15, 137:2, 137:4, 141:22 gland [1] - 69:20 gleaned [1] - 67:24 glottis [1] - 62:11 God [1] - 97:10 gold [1] - 47:3 GOVERNMENT[1] -1:12 government [1] -27:21 Government [40] -5:20, 23:3, 24:10, 25:5, 47:12, 69:22, 72:16, 73:7, 74:9, 90:18, 90:21, 90:23, 91:1, 103:3, 106:9, 107:7, 108:6, 109:2, 111:6, 111:8, 119:15, 120:10, 120:23, 125:2, 126:14, 126:21, 126:24, 127:9, 127:14, 132:22, 133:1, 133:10, 135:2, 135:20, 136:11, 138:17, 143:15, 145:8, 145:10 Government's [37] -7:21, 7:23, 8:6, 8:10, 24:18, 27:11, 27:16,

27:22, 43:13, 44:25, 47:1, 47:5, 47:6, 48:8, 48:13, 48:14, 48:22, 49:21, 50:3, 66:5, 66:8, 66:11, 68:8, 71:15, 71:18, 71:21, 72:4, 72:11, 72:13, 117:22, 120:9, 129:11, 129:15, 134:13, 134:22, 135:4, 138:6 **government's** [1] - 8:9 governs [1] - 40:6 grading [2] - 86:16, 87:1 gradually [4] - 13:2, 26:1, 97:23, 98:17

graduating [1] - 9:4

grand [1] - 21:12 grant [3] - 125:15, 125:16, 138:7 granted [2] - 122:3, 145:12 grave [1] - 93:10 greater [4] - 56:7, 56:9, 69:4, 70:1 group [7] - 11:20, 12:2, 12:4, 12:18, 13:21, 13:25, 50:13 grouped [1] - 92:19 quard [1] - 62:15 guess [1] - 88:16 guidance [5] - 50:25, 51:5, 52:9, 70:7, 138:13 Guidance [1] - 72:4 guide [1] - 68:6 guided [1] - 103:25 guideline [1] - 38:24 Guideline [1] - 68:18 Guidelines [3] - 87:16, 87:19, 111:3 guidelines [26] -38:21, 38:25, 39:4, 39:6, 41:12, 41:14, 41:16, 41:18, 42:5, 42:10, 42:12, 42:17, 42:21, 43:8, 43:19, 50:19, 51:9, 59:5, 70:11, 79:3, 87:23, 88:15, 88:17, 88:19, 88:22 guilt [1] - 123:23 gynecology [1] - 10:3

Н

habit [1] - 103:15

habituating [1] - 44:10 half [14] - 11:23, 15:2, 26:14, 26:17, 26:19, 76:8, 76:10, 113:25, 114:19, 114:22, 114:23, 114:24, 115:2 hall [2] - 52:13, 53:8 hallmark [1] - 121:25 hand [2] - 53:11, 53:14 handled [1] - 26:16 handles [1] - 23:25 hands [1] - 14:6 happy [1] - 140:5 harbor [1] - 39:3 harm [12] - 26:3, 44:2, 44:6, 52:12, 53:4, 55:11, 55:14, 55:15, 55:21, 55:23, 135:21

Harmarville [1] - 12:8 harms [4] - 52:1, 64:24, 69:17, 69:20 Harrington [1] -123:14 **HAVING** [1] - 6:20 hazard [1] - 26:5 hazardous [2] - 64:9, 64:10 head [2] - 13:14, 34:17 headache [6] - 29:15, 29:23, 29:24, 30:6, 30:7, 30:8 Health [4] - 17:16, 17:19, 36:8, 58:15 health [6] - 51:19, 51:23, 52:3, 52:7, 52:8, 55:24 Healthsouth [1] - 12:8 hear [18] - 16:22, 43:25, 93:25, 98:3, 120:2, 128:4, 128:6, 128:8, 132:13, 135:7, 136:8, 136:10, 137:9, 137:24, 138:23, 140:5, 144:8 heard [1] - 115:10 hearing [50] - 72:16, 73:20, 102:19, 102:24, 116:10, 118:8, 119:17, 119:19, 119:23, 120:1, 120:13, 120:14, 121:2, 121:23, 122:3, 125:16, 125:23, 127:17, 131:11, 131:13, 131:16, 131:18, 131:24, 132:3, 132:8, 132:13, 132:18, 133:11. 133:16. 134:17. 134:24. 137:3. 137:6. 137:18, 138:2, 138:7, 138:8, 139:23, 141:3, 141:9, 141:20, 142:1, 142:9, 142:11, 142:21, 142:22, 142:25, 143:18, 144:11, 144:19 Hearing [1] - 1:9 heavy [1] - 57:25 height [1] - 122:10 held [5] - 34:10, 126:1, 142:1, 142:10, 144:12

help [2] - 21:3, 103:7 helpful [1] - 140:22 helping [1] - 15:18 hemorrhage [1] - 62:2 hereby [1] - 146:6 hereinbefore [1] high [13] - 30:7, 51:24, 51:25, 52:1, 53:5, 53:24, 54:3, 56:4, 106:25, 108:21, 133:25 higher [8] - 55:14, 58:9, 64:15, 97:11, 97:14, 98:11, 98:15, 112:8 highlights [1] - 51:6 himself [3] - 90:10, 90:15, 135:10 historical [1] - 119:5 history [16] - 4:1, 38:17, 44:3, 52:19, 54:1, 57:3, 57:7, 57:24, 57:25, 58:2, 61:21, 62:25, 63:9, 96:16, 99:3, 105:12 hold [8] - 23:7, 71:10, 71:12, 77:6, 131:16, 141:20, 142:4, 142:24 holding [1] - 144:12 hometown [1] - 11:18 honest [1] - 137:12 Honor [75] - 3:2, 3:4, 3:20, 3:22, 6:3, 6:5, 6:9, 6:11, 6:15, 6:18, 7:2, 7:8, 7:15, 8:5, 8:8, 27:15, 27:20, 71:14, 71:19, 71:20, 72:10, 72:15, 72:22, 73:18, 73:24, 102:25, 103:5, 103:13, 103:14, 103:19, 104:2, 104:5, 114:6, 116:3, 116:8, 116:24, 117:1, 117:19, 117:25, 118:4, 118:10, 119:12, 119:14, 119:17, 119:20, 120:4, 120:12, 121:2, 121:21, 123:11, 123:13, 125:6, 127:19, 127:20, 128:2, 128:3, 128:20, 129:9, 130:2, 133:19, 133:20, 136:13,

137:11, 138:5,

140:8, 140:24, 140:25, 141:5, 141:12, 143:7, 143:15, 144:14, 144:15, 145:5, 145:16 Honorable [3] - 4:21, 5:17. 11:17 HONORABLE [1] -1:10 Hopkins [4] - 9:9, 9:13, 9:22, 75:3 Horsham [3] - 36:9, 113:9, 116:23 hospice [1] - 70:8 Hospital [9] - 9:9, 9:13, 9:22, 11:22, 12:9, 36:2, 36:6, 36:14, 113:1 hospital [10] - 11:22, 12:20, 14:10, 36:1, 36:6, 36:12, 83:18, 83:21, 83:23, 105:25 Hospitalization [1] -118:15 hospitalization [1] -119:3 hospitalizations [4] -106:2, 118:22, 118:23, 118:24 hospitals [5] - 11:21, 12:1, 14:9, 14:12, 21:13 hour [3] - 72:25, 127:11, 143:9 hours [7] - 22:20, 26:18, 26:19, 97:10, 114:24, 115:1, 115:3 hum [1] - 68:13 human [1] - 15:18 hunch [1] - 122:24 hydrocephalus [1] -30.7 hydrochloride [2] -24:21, 26:6 hypnotic [1] - 62:19 hypnotics [2] - 16:19, 67:1

iatrogenic [2] - 26:11, 52:10 identified [10] - 20:14, 21:7, 21:16, 42:23, 43:16, 47:1, 65:23, 66:4, 72:9, 141:6 identify [14] - 7:22, 21:3, 24:19, 52:17, 66:8, 68:21, 105:3,

106:5, 107:4, 107:13, 107:25, 108:18, 122:9, 128:9 idiosyncrasies [2] -51:11, 51:13 ignorance [1] - 59:23 ignores [2] - 57:9, 57:13 ignoring [1] - 137:5 II [1] - 58:25 illicit [1] - 101:18 imagine [3] - 59:20, 91:5, 91:20 imaging [2] - 106:1, 110:8 **IME** [1] - 77:6 IME's [1] - 77:11 immediately [1] -34:19 **impact** [1] - 89:15 impacted [1] - 53:3 impacts [1] - 52:3 impaired [2] - 17:21, 17:25 impairment [2] -17:22, 18:4 implantation [2] -14:21, 14:23 implantations [1] -82.23 implants [1] - 83:7 **imply** [1] - 42:13 important [14] - 37:10, 37:20, 42:10, 54:19, 54:23, 62:3, 62:15, 94:25, 98:24, 114:11, 114:13, 115:5, 123:3, 132:16 **importantly** [1] - 98:13 **impossible** [1] - 39:3 impression [2] -118:2, 135:2 improve [2] - 15:10, 15:11 improved [1] - 68:20 improvement [2] -69:5, 69:6 improving [1] - 12:11 impulse [1] - 55:19 impulses [1] - 14:24 IN [1] - 1:1 in-person [2] - 48:1, 48.2 inappropriate [1] -56:16

incidentally [1] -

include [7] - 66:4,

122:11, 122:15,

75:21, 105:9, 122:8,

54:20

62:22

122:23 included [11] - 4:3, 8:14, 10:1, 24:11, 34:21, 38:6, 66:15, 71:4, 120:16, 127:23, 142:7 includes [6] - 7:3, 15:11, 15:15, 15:16, 53:13, 53:16 including [8] - 4:18, 9:20, 16:17, 75:10, 75:11, 103:8, 106:1, 113:19 inclusion [1] - 123:6 inclusive [2] - 89:6, 92:24 incomplete [1] - 90:25 inconsistent [1] -108:14 inconvenience [2] -139:25, 143:22 incorporate [2] -82:10, 89:24 increase [11] - 26:1, 28:25, 55:9, 55:20, 56:15, 57:24, 58:3, 64:19, 69:1, 69:9, 69:17 increased [3] - 63:25, 64:2, 68:23 increases [1] - 55:21 increasing [2] - 22:3, 69:10 incumbent [1] - 121:4 indeed [2] - 46:12, 52:4 Independent [5] -4:16, 16:4, 16:5, 77:4, 77:5 independent [3] -16:6, 17:9, 17:11 indicate [2] - 74:19, 140:20 indicated [10] - 10:19, 12:19, 16:10, 27:11, 50:9, 104:4, 104:6, 104:22, 141:10, 143:2 indicates [1] - 140:2 indicating [2] - 3:16, 132:17 indication [2] - 19:1, 96:15 indictment [2] - 4:6, 65:23 individual [5] - 20:25, 45:16, 82:11, 99:3, 111:15 individualized [1] -

individually [1] -133:23 individuals [3] - 10:3, 21:14. 87:4 industry [1] - 34:1 infections [1] - 82:24 infer [1] - 116:20 inferred [1] - 116:22 inflection [4] - 68:21, 69:2, 69:7, 69:9 inform [3] - 89:7, 99:13, 99:14 information [60] -13:13. 19:21. 24:12. 24:15. 24:21. 25:1. 27:14, 37:24, 38:7, 38:17, 41:17, 42:4, 44:23, 52:22, 55:24, 57:4, 57:9, 59:19, 62:16, 64:6, 64:7, 70:4, 81:13, 87:1, 87:3, 89:14, 89:23, 91:15, 91:21, 103:1, 103:8, 121:5, 121:12, 122:7, 122:8, 122:12, 124:9, 124:18, 126:8, 127:2, 127:3, 130:13, 132:25, 133:2, 133:4, 133:24, 134:25, 135:3, 135:14, 135:21, 136:3, 136:6, 137:4, 138:2, 139:11, 140:11, 143:10 **informative** [1] - 60:15 informed [1] - 144:9 **informing** [1] - 45:7 infusion [1] - 14:22 inhalation [2] - 81:15, 81:19 inherent [1] - 58:6 initial [5] - 16:2, 56:8, 105:20, 112:13, 131:23 initiated [1] - 27:8 initiation [3] - 25:10, 25:16, 26:11 injection [1] - 14:20 injections [3] - 14:21, 15:12, 83:7 injured [3] - 12:14, 20:25, 29:17 injuries [5] - 29:16, 29:17, 29:19, 64:25 injuring [1] - 108:23 injury [1] - 75:23 inpatient [5] - 11:25, 12:6, 12:20, 14:9,

14:13 input [1] - 145:18 inquire [2] - 103:20, 103:21 inquiry [1] - 144:12 insensible [1] - 10:9 insert [3] - 24:11, 24:23, 72:7 inside [2] - 20:10, 109:25 insisted [1] - 135:14 instance [1] - 92:17 instances [2] - 14:13, 37:14 instead [3] - 48:3, 73:2, 130:25 Institute [1] - 16:3 institutions [2] - 79:2, 98:20 instructed [1] - 53:19 instructing [1] - 44:14 instruction [1] - 15:15 insufficient [3] -139:12, 139:14, 142:15 intend [1] - 145:3 intensity [2] - 55:9, 69:6 intent [2] - 45:24, 136:3 intention [1] - 137:7 intentionally [10] -120:15, 120:18, 121:11, 122:5, 122:19, 124:15, 133:1, 135:17, 139:6, 142:6 interact [1] - 16:20 interaction [1] - 12:13 interest [4] - 18:6, 22:4, 136:18, 144:1 interested [2] - 21:11, 21.15 interfere [1] - 17:3 internal [1] - 62:3 internist [1] - 104:9 internship [4] - 9:7, 9:16, 9:19, 9:20 interpose [1] - 127:14 interpret [1] - 56:4 interpreted [1] - 99:2 **interprets** [1] - 49:6 interrupt [2] - 133:12, 143:4 interrupted [1] - 143:9 interval [2] - 26:24, 92:24

intervals [1] - 44:5

interventional [4] -

14:15, 14:19, 15:1,

16:2, 16:9 interventions [1] -15:12 interview [10] - 35:15, 35:18, 35:21, 60:12, 120:22, 121:4, 121:18, 122:20, 125:19, 135:13 interviewed [11] -120:25, 121:8, 121:15, 124:13, 125:10, 125:12, 126:8, 135:9, 135:19, 136:5, 141:17 Interviewing [1] -125:17 intoxicated [1] - 53:8 intoxication [4] -64:24, 95:14, 96:12, 97:16 intraoperative [1] -93:24 intrathecal [2] - 13:6, 13:12 introduce [1] - 7:15 introduction [1] - 68:5 invasiveness [1] -70:19 inventory [1] - 115:22 investigated [1] -19:12 investigation [2] -19:22, 122:24 investigations [3] -20:5, 80:5, 80:20 investigative [1] -124:4 Investigator [2] - 73:3, 144:4 invite [1] - 127:13 involve [2] - 22:24, 27:1 involved [12] - 12:18, 32:13, 32:14, 32:16, 32:17, 32:19, 38:11, 65:14, 65:15, 74:24, 88:2, 143:22 involves [1] - 46:7 involving [1] - 33:7 irrelevant [1] - 90:6 IS [1] - 6:20 issuance [2] - 47:20, 127:22 issue [36] - 5:13, 5:25, 16:17, 20:17, 20:20, 21:25, 32:25, 70:21,

72:20, 72:23, 73:12,

83:6

Interventional [2] -

80:25, 81:1, 81:3, 95:5, 96:10, 119:22, 119:25, 120:3, 122:1, 126:13, 126:16, 128:20, 129:2, 130:3, 132:10, 134:13, 135:3, 137:10, 137:23, 140:4, 144:4, 145:1, 145:3, 145:9 issued [14] - 4:9, 5:10, 5:23, 5:25, 33:4, 45:4, 45:15, 45:21, 46:10, 47:24, 49:1, 65:23, 68:14, 126:14 issues [7] - 12:12, 19:9, 21:5, 71:3, 105:9, 128:25 issuing [6] - 45:3, 45:25, 46:5, 46:8, 52:14, 65:21 itself [4] - 65:1, 65:3, 139:19, 140:2

J

January [4] - 58:22, 108:2, 108:20, 113:2 job [1] - 12:25 jobs [1] - 14:2 John [1] - 60:2 Johns [3] - 9:9, 9:13, 9:22 joint [1] - 30:3 joints [1] - 29:19 joke [1] - 93:9 journal [1] - 91:4 Judge [22] - 5:6, 5:7, 5:14, 5:22, 6:4, 73:13, 111:25, 112:1, 119:10, 126:8, 126:13, 126:23, 129:24, 130:5, 131:3, 137:21, 140:22, 141:21, 143:4, 144:22, 145:15 judge [5] - 124:12, 128:22, 132:19, 135:1, 135:18 judgment [4] - 42:20, 88:2, 88:6, 88:12 judicial [1] - 144:5 **July** [4] - 50:8, 63:4, 112:25, 113:2 June [5] - 76:4, 76:11, 77:17, 117:5, 118:12 jurisdiction [1] - 31:15 jury [1] - 103:24

Justice [2] - 19:8, 66:10 justifying [1] - 133:11

Κ

44:11, 74:16, 145:14

keep [4] - 13:13,

KELLY [1] - 1:16

kind [2] - 121:25,

kinds [1] - 40:4

knife [1] - 70:18

knowing [1] - 34:1

131:16

knowingly [6] - 45:24, 127:24, 128:11, 131:22, 132:14, 142:5 knowledge [9] - 22:5, 38:11, 40:2, 46:11, 46:22, 59:23, 59:25, 103:7 known [7] - 64:21, 85:14. 98:18. 120:19, 122:17, 124:12, 124:16 knows [7] - 60:2, 60:3, 97:10, 141:19, 143:25 Kraynak [1] - 5:18 KRISTIN [4] - 1:23, 146:3, 146:13, 146:16 Kristina [26] - 3:24, 4:1, 4:9, 4:10, 33:15, 34:16, 35:6, 35:13, 35:24, 36:7, 36:14, 58:17, 60:12, 65:11, 81:18, 96:2, 105:8, 105:18, 107:10, 108:4, 108:24, 109:17, 115:12, 115:24, 116:15, 119:6 Kristina's [6] - 34:23.

L

35:3, 35:9, 35:16,

36:18, 36:21

label [1] - 24:10 labeled [2] - 51:24, 66:13 Labor [1] - 75:11 labor [1] - 10:13 Laboratory [1] - 24:20 laboratory [2] - 54:5, 101:11 labs [3] - 106:1, 106:4, 108:16

lack [3] - 52:25, 59:25, 69:3 lacking [1] - 142:17 lady [1] - 135:18 laid [2] - 42:15, 58:4 language [1] - 139:20 large [3] - 11:20, 12:18, 27:2 larger [1] - 34:21 last [23] - 8:4, 52:4, 54:24, 63:3, 63:7, 68:8, 85:17, 98:3, 108:25, 109:20, 110:13, 113:5, 113:10, 113:15, 113:16, 113:17, 114:4, 114:12, 114:15, 116:23, 129:10, 145:1 late [2] - 4:21, 58:20 Law [1] - 32:22 law [24] - 21:3, 21:7, 21:14, 31:3, 40:6, 46:2, 49:15, 67:25, 88:5, 88:9, 121:7, 121:21, 122:4, 122:22, 123:21, 124:10, 124:16, 125:4, 125:25, 126:12, 126:17, 132:17, 143:17 lawfulness [2] - 33:2, 33:3 laws [1] - 49:10 lay [3] - 20:9, 21:10, 21:13 layperson [2] - 86:19 lays [1] - 58:4 lead [2] - 123:20, 123:22 leadership [1] - 10:25 leading [3] - 4:2, 51:22, 136:21 leads [2] - 124:4, 124:8 learn [1] - 115:11 learned [2] - 22:5, 23:9 least [11] - 22:20, 37:1, 44:10, 48:2, 76:16, 87:3, 110:10, 113:11, 128:9, 129:16, 131:20 leave [1] - 13:21 leaving [2] - 55:13, 118:2 lecture [2] - 21:9, 21:20 lectured [4] - 18:9, 21:10, 21:12, 21:23

lectures [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 22:7, 85:1 led [2] - 63:18, 127:22 leeway [1] - 103:16 left [2] - 108:23, 112:24 legal [3] - 13:23, 40:7, 40.11 legitimacy [4] - 56:17, 57:1, 57:2, 66:2 legitimate [25] - 4:7, 5:11, 6:1, 19:10, 32:5, 33:5, 33:15, 33:24, 39:1, 39:5, 39:11, 39:14, 40:8, 42:19, 45:5, 45:15, 45:22, 47:24, 49:2, 52:15, 57:12, 65:3, 65:25, 117:11, 134:4 legitimize [1] - 46:24 length [1] - 116:14 lengths [1] - 134:14 lesion [4] - 106:21, 109:10, 109:14, 110:9 less [5] - 13:3, 128:25, 136:19 lethal [1] - 96:15 level [10] - 19:14, 19:15, 46:16, 46:21, 62:22, 63:14, 68:23, 97:14, 97:20, 138:18 levels [3] - 62:18, 67:16, 98:15 **Li** [5] - 4:22, 5:6, 5:13, 111:18, 111:20 liable [1] - 127:25 liberalize [2] - 22:1, 41:22 library [3] - 101:17, 102:1, 102:4 licensed [3] - 8:18, 23:2, 49:2 licensing [1] - 23:7 lie [2] - 21:5, 46:20 lied [2] - 126:9, 126:21 life [12] - 26:14, 26:17, 26:19, 52:5, 70:21, 70:23, 113:25, 114:19, 114:22, 114:23, 114:24, 115:2 ligament [1] - 30:4 light [2] - 139:3, 140:16 lightly [1] - 137:15 likelihood [5] - 55:20, 55:21, 56:15, 57:24, 135:25

likely [3] - 55:14,

55:15, 95:11 limb [1] - 29:15 limitations [1] - 89:22 limited [2] - 22:17, 135.6 limits [2] - 59:8, 68:16 line [9] - 29:18, 39:16, 42:8, 54:18, 82:13, 101:16, 105:14, 112:7, 122:10 lines [1] - 107:18 list [9] - 60:22, 74:17, 79:21, 91:6, 92:3, 92:4, 92:17, 101:10, 141:16 listed [7] - 80:12, 91:20, 92:8, 106:23, 132:25, 133:6 lit [1] - 42:23 literature [7] - 41:20, 41:21, 58:5, 59:5, 64:7, 69:4, 114:24 live [3] - 30:1, 30:2, 90:15 lives [1] - 15:11 lividity [4] - 85:23, 86:2, 86:4, 86:6 **Lividity** [1] - 86:5 **LLP**[1] - 1:16 located [1] - 32:10 locklear [1] - 125:8 logistical [1] - 119:25 long-acting [1] - 23:24 long-term [2] - 16:25, 18:6 longest [1] - 114:23 look [15] - 35:12, 38:14, 53:6, 56:6, 56:9, 67:16, 69:22, 88:1, 88:4, 88:5, 88:10, 88:11, 102:16, 137:3 looking [4] - 91:7, 95:17, 128:1, 139:1 loss [2] - 57:18, 63:10 lost [1] - 64:18 low [7] - 25:20, 28:20, 53:25, 98:1, 98:4, 98:18, 113:23 lower [4] - 58:10, 63:6, 64:14, 112:7 lowest [1] - 68:18 lung [1] - 62:5 lungs [2] - 62:8, 62:13 Lyrica [5] - 106:20, 106:22, 107:2, 107:3, 108:22

M

M.D [3] - 6:25, 9:6, 66:10 **M.D.'s** [1] - 18:22 machine [1] - 1:21 magistrate [3] - 122:6, 124:12, 135:18 Magistrate [1] -126:23 magistrate's [1] -123:4 magnitude [4] - 98:23, 114:15. 115:4. 138:17 mailed [1] - 50:22 main [1] - 11:22 maintain [1] - 128:10 maintenance [2] -27:4, 98:20 Major [1] - 11:12 majoring [1] - 9:2 man [1] - 29:18 manage [1] - 15:20 managed [4] - 18:22, 18:23, 67:6, 67:15 Management [6] -13:24, 16:8, 16:11, 75:15, 78:9 management [11] -10:25, 14:16, 15:3, 15:4, 15:13, 16:15, 16:18, 16:23, 17:2, 17:5, 67:1 managing [1] - 18:3 manner [6] - 33:21, 63:13, 63:18, 80:7, 96:18, 132:9 manufacturer [1] -24:13 March [11] - 3:7, 3:14, 41:14, 70:11, 92:14, 104:10, 104:13, 104:15, 104:17, 104:20, 117:6 **MARCH**[1] - 1:10 Margaret [2] - 35:16, 60:13 Mariani [1] - 111:25 MARIANI[1] - 1:10 mark[1] - 52:13 market [1] - 23:15 marks [1] - 53:9 Martin [6] - 3:5, 34:24, 66:10, 73:25, 104:9, 135:24 MARTIN [1] - 1:6 Marty [1] - 79:15

Maryland [1] - 9:10

material [3] - 91:8,

132:23, 142:14 materially [5] -127:24, 128:10, 131:22, 132:14, 139:5 materials [2] - 91:6, 143:1 matter [11] - 3:5, 4:22, 5:16, 59:9, 73:5, 119:16, 129:19, 136:19, 139:2, 142:21, 145:18 matters [2] - 76:17, 76:21 Matthew [1] - 5:17 Mauricia [1] - 123:14 maximal [1] - 26:21 mean [8] - 16:13, 22:13, 50:10, 50:18, 51:20, 76:9, 93:17, 113:23 meaning [3] - 45:23, 86:5, 135:3 means [8] - 14:18, 50:19, 60:21, 61:23, 113:13, 135:17, 137:8, 146:22 meant [4] - 84:6, 84:12, 101:21, 103:13 measured [1] - 64:20 mechanism [4] - 28:3, 62:21, 65:16 mechanisms [5] -15:9, 30:9, 64:13, 64:22, 70:13 Medicaid [2] - 19:2, 20:3 medical [78] - 4:1, 4:4, 4:7, 4:8, 5:8, 5:11, 6:1, 9:5, 9:6, 9:21, 11:6, 13:10, 13:23, 17:9, 17:11, 19:20, 20:10, 21:12, 21:14, 22:4, 30:25, 31:4, 33:5, 33:19, 34:5, 34:24, 34:25, 35:8, 37:12, 37:22, 38:13, 38:22, 40:20, 41:20, 42:4, 42:7, 42:15, 43:5, 44:11, 45:15, 47:25, 49:2, 49:22, 50:13, 50:20, 52:9, 52:16, 55:19, 56:20, 56:21, 56:25, 57:14, 59:14, 60:8, 61:22, 64:7, 65:21, 65:25, 69:3, 71:11, 71:13, 77:14, 77:15, 81:18, 88:2, 92:8, 92:10,

28:25, 29:6, 56:8,

92:13, 92:19, 99:21, 105:9, 118:21, 129:12, 134:4, 138:20 Medical [20] - 4:16, 9:8, 9:17, 11:9, 16:4, 16:5. 17:15. 17:20. 40:22. 41:7. 50:6. 50:12, 50:16, 50:20, 50:21, 51:1, 60:9, 77:4, 77:5, 78:25 medical/legal [4] -75:18, 76:7, 76:15, 77.6 medically [14] - 19:10, 32:5, 33:15, 33:24, 39:1, 39:4, 39:11, 39:14, 40:8, 42:18, 45:5, 57:12, 65:3, 117:11 Medicare [1] - 20:3 medication [13] - 15:4, 44:5, 44:8, 44:12, 44:13, 49:6, 53:1, 64:12, 82:8, 93:2, 94:8, 107:20, 107:23 medication-taking [1] - 64:12 medications [10] -14:22, 15:20, 20:21, 25:24, 55:17, 55:18, 78:22, 78:23, 106:15, 108:21 medicine [58] - 7:16, 8:17, 8:18, 9:12, 10:7, 11:11, 11:24, 11:25, 12:5, 12:7, 12:25, 13:2, 13:8, 13:9, 13:17, 13:22, 14:11, 15:8, 15:21, 16:22, 16:24, 20:8, 20:9, 20:11, 20:12, 29:22, 31:1, 32:13, 32:14, 32:15, 32:16, 33:25, 39:9, 39:17, 40:6, 44:1, 46:5, 51:14, 57:2, 57:11, 60:2, 61:3, 64:4, 67:19, 67:24, 76:3, 82:21, 83:4, 86:13, 86:14, 86:15, 86:20, 86:21, 86:25, 87:24, 93:20, 95:1 Medicine [18] - 4:16, 9:6, 9:14, 10:1, 10:20, 11:19, 15:25, 18:8, 18:19, 18:20, 18:23, 41:25, 74:20, 74:24, 74:25, 75:4, 75:5, 75:7

medicines [2] - 12:13, 18.7 meet [2] - 7:17, 139:15 member [3] - 14:10, 18:8, 78:25 memorandum [2] -5:22, 141:11 Memorial [1] - 36:2 memory [1] - 85:13 mentioned [17] -22:24, 43:5, 43:6, 49:20, 63:23, 68:7, 74:23, 78:7, 81:7, 81:21, 81:24, 84:15, 85:25, 86:3, 146:8 Mercy [1] - 11:22 metabolite [1] - 63:15 metabolizing [1] -94:7 metastases [1] - 70:19 Methadone [97] -22:25, 23:1, 23:4, 23:8, 23:12, 23:14, 23:16, 23:17, 23:24, 24:1, 24:5, 24:10, 24:11, 24:12, 24:14, 24:16, 24:21, 24:22, 24:23, 25:10, 25:12, 26:6, 26:14, 26:16, 27:1, 27:2, 27:4, 27:7, 27:10, 27:13, 28:9, 28:10, 28:14, 28:15, 28:16, 28:18, 28:21, 28:22, 28:24, 29:1, 29:3, 29:5, 53:24, 58:8, 62:19, 63:4, 63:5, 63:6, 63:15, 63:19, 63:24, 64:1, 64:13, 65:15, 67:9, 67:11, 72:7, 81:2, 81:5, 81:8, 81:10, 95:14, 95:18, 96:2, 96:12, 96:22, 97:16, 98:4, 98:12, 98:15, 98:19, 98:20, 99:18, 100:5, 100:6, 111:1, 111:8, 111:12, 112:3, 112:8, 112:23, 113:1, 113:9, 113:13, 113:18, 113:20, 113:25, 114:4, 114:19, 114:22, 115:11, 115:13, 116:19, 116:23 Methadone's [1] -26:6 methodology [8] -

37:3, 37:5, 37:8,

88:11, 89:8, 102:20, 103:1, 103:20 methods [2] - 5:3, 5:5 Michael [1] - 6:24 MICHAEL [1] - 6:25 Michelle [2] - 1:13, 132.11 middle [1] - 10:25 Middle [4] - 4:21, 76:25, 146:4, 146:18 MIDDLE [1] - 1:1 might [3] - 120:1, 122:23, 139:25 migraine [1] - 30:7 Milford [1] - 3:12 milieu [2] - 41:18, 51:19 military [2] - 11:3, 11:15 mill [1] - 96:23 Milligram [5] - 27:25, 28:2, 68:10, 68:11, 68:15 milligram [5] - 23:15, 69:12, 69:15, 99:6, 99:18 milligrams [34] -28:16, 28:17, 28:20, 28:22, 28:23, 28:24, 28:25, 29:3, 29:5, 29:6. 56:7. 56:10. 67:10, 67:11, 68:22, 68:24, 69:2, 69:4, 69:7, 69:8, 98:19, 98:22, 99:17, 111:9, 111:11, 111:12, 112:24, 113:9, 113:14, 113:15, 113:16, 113:18, 113:20 milliliter [6] - 96:3, 96:6, 96:20, 97:19, 100:6, 100:8 millimeter [1] - 99:25 mind [1] - 139:11 mine [1] - 22:4 mini [1] - 103:23 mini-trial [1] - 103:23 minimize [3] - 14:25, 55:23, 57:19 minimizing [3] -12:11, 26:2, 67:19 minimum [1] - 136:7 minor [1] - 9:2 minute [3] - 86:8, 90:17, 117:23 minutes [3] - 72:18, 72:22, 131:5 mischaracterized [1] -134:10

mischaracterizes [2] -134:4, 134:6 misconduct [1] -19.17 misled [2] - 122:6, 135:17 misrepresentation [1] - 135:5 misrepresentations [1] - 127:9 misrepresented [2] -133:1, 136:6 miss [1] - 37:10 missed [1] - 138:20 mistake [2] - 112:2, 136:22 mistakes [1] - 39:7 mitigation [2] - 57:16, 58:12 mixed [5] - 65:13, 95:13, 97:16, 100:10 **MME's** [4] - 68:9, 70:1, 70:7, 72:5 Model [5] - 40:22, 50:6, 50:16, 60:10, 71:25 model [6] - 41:4, 41:5, 41:11, 50:22, 51:2, 79:3 modest [1] - 69:1 moment [15] - 9:15, 29:9, 34:15, 35:22, 85:7, 85:10, 96:6, 102:17, 103:12, 113:7, 114:15, 115:21, 116:1, 116:5, 127:16 monitoring [3] -15:15, 58:14, 58:25 Monitoring [4] -35:24, 58:19, 58:20, 58:24 Monroe [1] - 123:14 months [1] - 63:21 monumental [1] -130:7 morally [1] - 70:25 $\pmb{morning}\ [6]\ \textbf{-}\ 3{:}1,\ 3{:}2,$ 3:3, 3:4, 7:13, 7:14 Morphine [20] - 27:25, 28:2, 68:9, 68:11, 68:15, 68:22, 69:4, 69:8, 69:12, 69:15, 106:17, 106:22, 106:23, 106:25, 107:1, 110:25, 111:9, 111:11, 114:1 morphine [11] - 28:4, 28:6, 28:11, 28:17,

28:19, 28:21, 28:23,

56:10 mortis [1] - 86:2 Morton's [1] - 25:22 most [21] - 17:21, 19:8, 20:17, 20:19, 26:18, 27:1, 27:14, 29:17, 29:21, 29:22, 37:10, 44:16, 49:25, 50:1, 50:2, 70:22, 98:20, 101:18, 115:2, 129:19, 133:21 mostly [1] - 42:11 mother [2] - 35:16, 60:13 motion [5] - 5:23, 73:16, 131:9, 137:9, 137:18 Motion [4] - 3:9, 3:10, 5:21, 119:24 motions [4] - 3:8, 124:21, 124:24, 134:14 mouth [1] - 62:5 move [10] - 8:5, 16:10, 27:15, 71:14, 71:20, 104:5, 118:7, 119:21, 119:24, 130:15 moved [1] - 111:6 moves [1] - 23:21 moving [2] - 118:8, 120:6 MR [53] - 3:3, 3:4, 6:11, 6:15, 8:8, 27:20, 71:19, 72:10, 72:22, 73:18, 73:24, 74:2, 102:25, 103:13, 103:19, 104:2, 104:3, 114:10, 116:13, 116:24, 117:19. 118:4. 119:12. 119:20. 126:13. 127:20, 128:3, 128:22, 129:24, 130:5, 130:12, 130:20, 130:24, 132:19, 132:21, 133:9, 133:13, 133:19, 135:1, 135:17, 137:11, 137:21, 138:9, 138:13, 138:25, 140:8, 140:10, 140:22, 140:24, 141:5, 143:4, 143:25, 145:15 MRI [1] - 109:21

N

naive [6] - 63:20, 98:5, 112:15, 112:18, 112:21, 113:21 name [5] - 6:22, 6:24, 13:20, 24:13, 127:1 names [1] - 28:7 nanograms [10] -

96:3, 96:5, 96:19, 96:23, 97:19, 99:6, 99:18, 99:24, 100:5, 100.8 narrow [1] - 17:4 nature [10] - 20:16. 23:16, 32:12, 37:12, 37:22, 38:6, 70:19, 124:8, 137:18, 141:25 necessary [11] - 22:1, 25:15, 37:22, 52:20, 82:18, 128:15, 132:3, 133:16, 134:24, 142:8, 145:9 neck [1] - 29:15 need [13] - 53:7, 83:1, 87:7, 95:10, 128:4, 128:7, 128:8, 137:19, 137:23, 139:21, 141:20, 144:23, 145:13 needed [2] - 14:2, 119:25 needs [2] - 118:3, 126:5 negate [1] - 123:21 negative [6] - 62:12, 101:10, 101:22, 101:24, 110:16, 122.25 negligent [2] - 39:10, 65:2 nerve [6] - 14:20, 14:24, 14:25, 29:16, 30:4, 93:4 nerves [2] - 29:19, 110:6 neuralgia [1] - 30:6 neuropathic [3] -29:16, 30:5, 82:13 never [16] - 32:24, 42:15, 77:21, 77:25, 78:5, 83:17, 83:20, 83:23, 83:25, 84:2, 90:8, 105:22, 120:24, 121:15, 131:23, 138:7 new [1] - 28:4 next [8] - 9:4, 14:1, 26:23, 27:6, 48:21, 57:5, 69:7, 134:16 night [3] - 85:18, 129:10, 129:21 non [9] - 20:1, 54:10, 55:2, 55:19, 68:25, 70:12, 70:16, 70:17,

non-cancer [6] - 55:2,

68:25, 70:12, 70:16,

70:17, 71:2 non-controlled [1] -20:1 non-medical [1] -55:19 non-use [1] - 54:10 None [1] - 68:3 none [2] - 126:14, 135:14 nordiazepam [5] -62:19, 63:15, 65:18, 95:14, 96:14 normal [2] - 82:20, 93:20 normally [1] - 110:2 normative [4] - 42:9, 42:12, 42:21, 88:20 normatively [1] -20:12 North [2] - 123:15, 125:9 north [1] - 20:13 Nos [4] - 66:5, 66:6, 71:15, 72:13 note [20] - 20:14, 22:9, 104:14, 105:4, 105:5, 105:18, 106:7, 106:12, 106:17, 107:6, 107:10, 107:15, 107:16, 108:2, 108:20, 108:24, 109:4, 109:6, 109:16, 109:19 noted [6] - 33:18, 80:12, 85:6, 85:13, 110:11, 110:23 notes [9] - 35:9, 84:9, 84:12, 106:15, 108:16, 109:13, 109:19, 117:4, 118:20 nothing [2] - 119:10, 119:12 notice [2] - 85:25, 100:12 **notified** [1] - 127:5 November [3] - 5:23, 106:8, 117:5 number [16] - 17:23, 21:2, 23:13, 30:16, 76:13, 94:12, 95:5, 95:9, 95:22, 96:5, 96:19, 126:19, 126:20, 141:3, 143:5, 143:8 numbered [1] - 146:9 numbers [3] - 95:10, 134:5, 134:8

numerous [1] - 20:14

nuns [1] - 30:1 0 O.R [1] - 12:24 oath [5] - 111:23, 117:20, 133:5, 138:10, 141:5 oaths [3] - 120:21, 133:21, 134:2 object [4] - 102:18, 104:1, 117:19, 129:12 objection [14] - 8:7, 8:8, 27:20, 71:18, 71:19, 72:8, 72:10, 114:6, 116:3, 116:5, 117:23, 127:14, 130:10, 143:13 **Objective** [1] - 106:13 objective [4] - 51:12, 54:8, 54:12, 110:8 objects [1] - 120:10 **obligation** [1] - 137:5 **observable** [1] - 115:2 observation [2] -51:16. 87:3 observations [5] -37:15, 38:3, 46:12, 54:5, 54:6 observed [8] - 26:25, 37:18, 53:2, 54:3, 67:7, 67:8, 81:12, 100:2 obstetrics [1] - 10:3 obtain [3] - 60:8, 124:6, 126:23 obtained [6] - 9:6, 11:17, 113:3, 113:6, 122:12, 133:4 obtaining [1] - 61:23 obtains [1] - 62:17 obvious [1] - 62:2 obviously [4] - 86:12, 129:2, 137:15, 143:22 occasional [1] - 53:16 occasionally [4] -15:13, 19:20, 53:18, 62:10 occasions [5] - 21:2, 31:23, 32:18, 76:16, 78:17 Occupational [1] -18:12 occur [16] - 22:3, 26:7, 30:9, 39:7, 39:10, 44:2, 55:11, 56:14, 62:9, 62:13, 64:22,

64:24, 94:12, 98:17,

98:18, 98:21 occurred [5] - 37:19, 41:2, 67:7, 68:1, 96:17 occurrence [1] - 53:16 occurrences [1] - 39:9 occurring [5] - 38:15, 56:15, 59:21, 63:1, 96:15 occurs [5] - 46:6, 55:10, 64:14, 64:16, 109:24 October [3] - 8:4, 109:19, 117:5 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:9 offer [4] - 3:15, 119:16, 139:4, 139:15 offered [7] - 4:2, 4:4, 4:8, 4:24, 12:25, 18:1, 21:2 offering [1] - 3:22 Office [3] - 19:2, 19:4, 32:2 **OFFICE** [1] - 1:12 office [19] - 35:9, 92:11, 92:13, 92:20, 92:22, 104:12, 104:14, 104:16, 104:19, 105:4, 105:5, 105:18, 106:7, 107:6, 107:10, 108:24, 109:7, 110:22, 141:8 officer [7] - 122:5, 122:8, 122:10, 123:18, 123:24, 125:19, 125:24 officer's [1] - 124:5 officers [5] - 122:23, 123:3, 123:21, 124:16, 126:1 official [1] - 85:16 Official [3] - 146:3, 146:14, 146:17 often [1] - 16:22 **oftentimes** [1] - 94:8 Ohio [4] - 9:2, 11:9, 31:11, 32:11 Old [4] - 110:13, 117:16. 118:12. 118:19 old [2] - 9:21, 105:25 Olshefski [10] - 1:13, 3:13, 103:17, 104:1, 116:25, 119:15, 141:9, 141:23, 143:13, 145:7 OLSHEFSKI [56] - 3:2, 3:20, 3:22, 6:18, 7:2,

7:8, 7:12, 7:18, 8:5, 8:12, 13:15, 27:15, 27:18, 27:24, 71:14, 71:20, 72:15, 102:18, 114:6, 116:3, 116:8, 117:1, 117:3, 117:25, 118:10, 118:11, 119:10, 119:17, 120:4, 120:6, 127:19, 128:2, 128:20, 129:9, 130:1, 130:11, 130:17, 130:21, 131:3, 133:20, 134:21, 135:16, 136:13, 138:5, 138:12. 138:23. 140:9. 140:25. 141:12, 141:15, 143:15, 144:14, 144:22, 144:24, 145:8, 145:16 omissions [4] - 39:8, 120:17, 122:1, 122:18 omit [1] - 143:21 omitted [5] - 120:18, 121:12, 122:7, 122:10, 125:24 omitting [1] - 143:21 once [6] - 13:21, 28:18, 28:19, 48:21, 130:25, 140:7 one [60] - 5:11, 9:20, 12:2, 17:10, 19:16, 24:13, 25:16, 27:6, 28:18, 29:18, 31:4. 32:25, 48:2, 48:12, 49:25, 50:1, 50:2, 50:17, 51:5, 54:11, 56:8, 57:7, 57:8, 59:24, 60:2, 60:5, 62:7, 62:17, 64:16, 65:14, 68:8, 68:10, 73:6, 79:22, 81:1, 91:5, 91:12, 91:13, 91:17, 99:15, 108:25, 113:4, 113:7, 113:22, 117:25, 121:10, 122:11, 124:4, 126:9, 126:19, 128:21, 130:1, 131:14, 132:5, 142:14, 143:12 ones [1] - 90:24 ongoing [1] - 17:12 open [1] - 76:24 operating [1] - 11:23

operation [1] - 15:13 operations [1] - 10:10 operative [3] - 10:4, 13:3, 15:14 operatively [1] - 10:11 opiates [1] - 119:3 opine [1] - 33:2 opined [3] - 5:12, 90:11, 109:16 opining [1] - 89:20 opinion [38] - 3:9, 3:18, 4:5, 4:9, 5:14, 5:22. 19:19. 32:7. 40:7. 40:11. 47:4. 52:13, 52:14, 61:12, 65:10, 65:21, 66:1, 66:2, 66:21, 71:12, 86:17, 88:13, 89:8, 89:15, 90:3, 103:22, 109:17, 115:8, 115:9. 116:11. 117:7, 118:18, 119:8, 125:13, 134:12, 137:14, 137:23, 139:1 opinions [28] - 18:2, 30:20, 31:23, 32:13, 32:14, 32:19, 36:24, 40:2, 42:25, 43:2, 44:21, 47:2, 48:9, 49:18, 51:4, 60:16, 66:4, 66:14, 66:15, 66:20, 70:5, 71:8, 71:10, 76:15, 102:23, 103:22, 114:8, 140:3 Opioid [4] - 50:7, 50:24, 71:25, 72:4 opioid [32] - 17:25, 21:16, 21:18, 21:20, 23:24, 24:3, 25:11, 25:16, 27:4, 42:1, 42:3, 42:8, 51:2, 51:7, 51:18, 51:21, 51:24, 53:5, 58:22, 63:3, 63:20, 64:1, 64:6, 64:21, 80:11, 80:22, 112:14, 112:18, 112:21, 112:22, 113:21, 113:23 opioid-related [1] -80:11 opioid-type [1] - 24:3 Opioids [2] - 40:23, 41.23 opioids [24] - 16:17,

23:9, 23:17, 25:13,

28:3, 28:5, 42:9,

44:9, 52:2, 54:25,

55:1, 56:4, 56:5, 58:9, 64:5, 64:13, 64:25, 66:25, 68:2, 78:18, 106:3, 110:15, 114:12, 118:24 opportunity [4] -36:20. 131:25. 138:6, 143:16 opposed [2] - 14:2, 101:25 ops [1] - 20:20 OR [1] - 93:13 order [22] - 14:25, 17:3, 26:1, 28:6, 37:17, 37:19, 37:23, 39:13, 41:9, 45:21, 46:12, 46:23, 52:20, 53:4, 71:6, 73:9, 77:8, 92:4, 92:14, 95:11, 140:18 orders [3] - 109:10, 114:15, 115:4 organ [1] - 62:3 organic [1] - 81:14 organization [1] -50:17 organizations [3] -21:10, 21:12, 21:14 osteopaths [1] - 18:23 Osteopathy [2] -18:20, 18:24 otherwise [2] - 60:1, 139:16 outcome [3] - 57:19, 57:20, 57:24 outcomes [2] - 86:22, 91:8 outflow [1] - 110:3 outlined [2] - 41:10, 145:19 outpatient [9] - 11:25, 12:6, 12:21, 14:8, 22:15, 22:18, 22:23, 23:2, 67:19 outside [3] - 23:6, 136:2, 136:3 outweighs [1] - 27:10 overall [6] - 17:7, 38:5, 95:8, 115:6, 117:8, 129:3 overdose [10] - 26:11, 54:1, 64:21, 64:23, 67:5, 67:14, 69:18, 93:16, 98:21, 100:6 overdosed [2] - 67:5, 67:8 overdoses [3] - 23:13, 51:22, 67:8 overlay [1] - 41:1

overuse [1] - 20:21 owed [1] - 11:6 own [6] - 67:20, 126:17, 128:11, 129:13, 136:17, 139:1 oxycodone [2] -53:25, 108:22

p.m [1] - 85:20 P.O [1] - 146:18 **p.O** [1] - 1:14 PA [3] - 3:12, 40:16, 88:10 package [3] - 24:23, 38:24, 72:7 packages [1] - 24:11 page [12] - 37:13, 47:12, 47:13, 48:21, 104:6, 105:14, 106:5, 107:4, 107:13, 107:25, 108:18, 109:5 Page [6] - 100:20, 101:5, 105:1, 109:5. 111:8, 117:14 page-turning [1] -37:13 pages [5] - 36:23, 37:1, 39:25, 92:7, 115:25 paid [1] - 11:4 Pain [17] - 4:15, 11:19, 13:23, 15:25, 16:3, 16:9, 40:23, 41:23, 41:24, 42:6, 50:7, 72:1, 74:20, 75:14, 107:20 pain [104] - 7:16, 8:17, 9:12. 10:9. 11:10. 11:24, 11:25, 12:5, 12:7, 12:10, 12:13, 12:25, 13:2, 13:8, 13:9, 13:16, 13:22, 14:11, 14:15, 14:25, 15:5, 15:7, 15:8, 15:10, 15:14, 15:19, 15:21, 16:16, 16:20, 16:22, 16:24, 17:1, 17:2, 17:3, 17:5, 17:7, 17:24, 18:4, 18:7, 18:9, 19:25, 21:24, 21:25, 22:2, 23:4, 25:10, 27:2, 27:8, 29:13, 29:15, 29:16, 29:22, 29:23, 29:24, 30:5, 30:6, 30:9, 31:1, 32:13,

32:14, 32:15, 32:16, 51:3, 54:25, 55:2, 55:9, 61:22, 68:25, 69:6, 70:12, 70:14, 70:15, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 70:23, 71:1, 71:2, 71:4, 77:20, 78:18, 82:8, 82:13, 82:21, 83:7, 93:2, 93:4, 93:5, 95:1, 105:9, 107:22, 108:21 pains [2] - 29:22, 29:24 palliative [2] - 27:9, 93:3 palpates [1] - 109:13 paper [3] - 16:14, 58:4, 91:14 papers [1] - 104:14 paradigms [1] - 71:6 paragraph [10] - 25:8, 26:4, 26:23, 92:2, 104:7, 107:18, 108:12, 109:20, 110:12, 110:13 paragraphs [1] - 25:4 parameters [1] - 47:20 part [41] - 17:4, 21:7, 24:25, 25:2, 29:25, 30:10, 38:10, 41:1, 42:3, 43:15, 43:19, 46:20, 48:12, 50:17, 50:19, 50:24, 50:25, 51:18, 52:5, 52:10, 60:6, 60:7, 64:15, 67:18, 75:2, 82:20, 83:3, 83:6, 84:12, 88:11, 90:8, 93:15, 93:20, 95:8, 96:25, 97:17, 98:3, 117:20, 117:21, 129:3 particular [22] - 19:9, 25:15, 37:14, 43:22, 44:18, 46:6, 46:25, 48:18, 51:13, 58:16, 61:16, 65:6, 68:5, 73:16, 88:21, 95:11, 95:24, 96:5, 114:14, 131:9, 131:12, 137:8 particularly [24] -17:20, 20:3, 20:19, 23:14, 24:13, 26:8, 26:11, 33:22, 40:16, 42:2, 42:5, 43:6, 44:8, 44:18, 49:17,

53:10. 56:14. 56:23.

59:19. 63:15. 64:17.

75:3, 95:12, 116:22

parties [1] - 46:19

partners [3] - 13:5, 13:11, 14:1 parts [4] - 20:2, 37:21, 118:2, 137:9 passed [1] - 93:22 passes [1] - 54:11 passing [1] - 81:12 past [4] - 64:8, 67:22, 76:6, 118:8 Pat [3] - 133:20, 135:16, 138:24 patch [3] - 102:9, 102:11, 102:14 pathologist [6] -77:15, 83:17, 84:17, 84:18, 94:2, 95:2 pathology [1] - 81:17 Pathology [1] - 83:20 patient [78] - 12:11, 19:11, 20:25, 24:25, 25:19, 26:2, 30:10, 34:4, 37:15, 38:3, 38:14, 44:3, 44:4, 44:15, 46:6, 46:8, 46:12, 46:15, 48:2, 49:7, 52:20, 52:25, 53:1, 53:17, 53:23, 54:7, 54:9, 54:10, 54:16, 54:19, 55:7, 55:16, 56:10, 56:18, 56:22, 56:25, 57:10, 57:20, 57:22, 57:23, 59:10, 59:13, 59:18, 59:21, 60:23, 60:24, 61:2, 62:7, 63:1, 63:2, 63:9, 63:10, 63:20, 65:5, 67:9, 68:19, 71:4, 82:11, 82:19, 82:22, 82:25, 88:1, 95:23, 96:16, 97:1, 97:9, 99:3, 99:17, 99:19, 99:20, 105:12, 105:23, 110:22, 114:2, 133:2, 135:6, 136:5 patient's [5] - 15:7, 15:10, 37:16, 38:9, 56.2 patients [60] - 10:9, 10:12, 10:13, 14:6, 14:13, 15:17, 16:6, 17:1, 17:7, 17:8, 25:10, 25:13, 26:20, 27:1, 27:3, 27:7, 29:11, 29:13, 29:14, 30:16, 40:13, 41:13, 44:7, 51:17, 53:14, 54:3, 62:14, 64:5, 64:11, 67:6, 67:7, 67:8, 67:14, 67:20,

70:24, 75:22, 75:25, 77:18, 82:2, 82:5, 82:24, 92:25, 93:6, 93:7, 93:17, 93:21, 94:4, 96:11, 97:18, 97:23, 97:24, 112:11, 114:25, 115:2, 133:21, 133:23, 133:25, 141:16 Patrick [1] - 1:17 Patt [1] - 11:13 pattern [2] - 37:17, 116:21 Patterson [1] - 11:8 pause [1] - 143:12 paying [1] - 37:13 PC [2] - 75:15, 125:18 **PDMP** [4] - 35:23, 59:4, 133:25, 134:8 peak [2] - 26:6, 26:8 pebble [1] - 70:17 pediatric [1] - 10:13 pediatrics [1] - 10:3 peer [13] - 80:4, 80:7, 80:10, 80:15, 86:21, 91:4, 91:7, 91:12, 91:17, 99:7, 99:16, 114:17 peer-reviewed [12] -80:4, 80:7, 80:10, 80:15, 86:21, 91:4, 91:12, 91:17, 99:7, 99:16, 114:17 pen [1] - 58:4 penalties [1] - 46:1 pencil [1] - 16:14 pending [1] - 5:16 PENNSYLVANIA[3] -1:1, 1:11, 1:25 Pennsylvania [50] -1:15, 1:19, 4:21, 8:19, 9:8, 9:16, 11:18, 17:15, 17:20, 18:14, 18:19, 19:3, 19:13, 31:11, 31:14, 33:22, 34:2, 36:17, 40:12, 40:13, 41:7, 43:6, 43:7, 43:15, 43:20, 43:22, 44:19, 48:13, 48:16, 49:9, 49:10, 50:9, 50:10, 50:16, 50:21, 51:1, 51:10, 58:15, 59:1, 60:6, 71:22, 72:2, 79:13, 115:7,

115:22, 146:5,

146:18, 146:19

people [23] - 15:22,

20:9, 20:11, 21:11,

26:19, 52:5, 53:23, 53:24, 54:1, 55:5, 56:22, 62:9, 67:3, 70:22, 73:1, 98:15, 126:10, 127:11, 130:6, 133:6, 138:19, 140:1, 140:5 per [23] - 28:20, 28:24. 28:25, 29:4, 29:5, 29:8, 68:15, 70:1, 96:3, 96:6, 96:19, 96:23, 97:19, 98:19, 98:22, 99:6, 99:18, 99:25, 100:5, 100:8, 111:11, 112:24, 113:18 perceive [1] - 20:6 percent [8] - 12:24, 12:25, 13:9, 56:11, 64:20, 75:20, 75:21, percentage [2] -75:17, 86:9 perforce [1] - 123:2 performance [1] -14:20 performed [5] - 9:15, 12:20, 13:2, 61:17, 110:24 performing [4] - 12:2, 40:19, 82:23, 86:10 perhaps [1] - 143:15 period [17] - 14:5, 14:7, 15:14, 24:6, 26:9, 41:19, 53:10, 56:5, 56:11, 68:4, 68:20, 77:17, 85:21, 112:23, 113:19, 113:22, 134:1 periods [2] - 10:11, 113:19 peripherally [1] -97:12 perjury [1] - 142:12 permitted [1] - 140:11 perniciously [1] -123:2 persistently [1] -20:18 persists [1] - 26:8 person [8] - 29:17, 45:24, 45:25, 48:1, 48:2, 48:3, 73:6, 90:15 personal [2] - 57:25, 75:23 persons [1] - 128:6 perspective [2] -128:4, 138:6 persuasive[1] - 6:6

pharmacist [8] -45:20, 46:8, 46:11, 46:17, 46:18, 46:21, 49.6 pharmacists [2] -46:4. 124:25 pharmacodynamics [2] - 23:20, 23:22 pharmacokinetics [3] - 23:20, 23:21, 25:12 pharmacology [5] -10:15, 23:19, 46:23, 58:9 pharmacovigilance [4] - 53:11, 57:4, 57:8, 58:13 pharmacy [1] - 135:21 pharmokinetics [1] -111:15 phase [1] - 28:19 **Phil** [1] - 134:19 philosophically [1] -71:1 Philosophy [1] - 9:3 photo [1] - 122:10 photograph [1] -115:15 photographs [2] -36:20, 115:10 physical [8] - 15:15, 38:14. 38:18. 44:4. 52:23, 57:3, 57:7, 62:4 physician [52] - 7:16, 8:15, 8:17, 13:24, 18:2, 18:15, 19:12, 22:20, 32:4, 33:20, 34:8, 38:24, 40:18, 41:6, 41:15, 46:7, 46:9, 46:13, 46:16, 46:17, 46:18, 46:21, 47:19, 48:4, 50:23, 51:13, 52:19, 52:22, 53:2, 53:10, 54:13, 55:22, 57:5, 58:3, 58:23, 59:3, 59:9, 59:10, 59:22, 60:22, 77:21, 77:22, 77:25, 79:12, 79:16, 79:19, 82:22, 83:3, 88:21, 136:1 Physician [2] - 11:19, 22:10 physician's [3] -19:23, 40:10, 59:6 Physician's [3] -17:16, 17:19, 25:2 Physicians [1] - 16:9 physicians [36] - 12:2, 12:5, 17:21, 17:24,

18:14, 19:18, 19:19, 22:15, 23:4, 23:12, 29:21, 34:1, 37:14, 37:19, 38:4, 38:21, 38:22, 41:9, 41:21, 43:8, 43:23, 51:7, 51:11, 52:10, 52:11, 58:18, 58:19, 59:23, 68:2, 79:17, 81:2, 88:15, 110:24, 113:4 physiologically [2] -71:1, 113:22 **physiology** [1] - 10:15 picture [2] - 89:11, 89:19 piece [1] - 126:2 pill [4] - 53:16, 58:13, 115:23, 116:2 pills [2] - 53:20, 115:18 Pittsburgh [7] - 11:18, 11:19, 11:21, 11:22, 12:16, 75:15, 86:10 pituitary [1] - 69:20 place [4] - 23:5, 94:7, 122:22, 131:7 placebo [1] - 87:2 placebo-controlled [1] - 87:2 placed [1] - 23:11 places [1] - 81:21 plain [2] - 40:5, 77:16 Plaintiff [2] - 31:18, 124:9 plaintiff [1] - 1:4 Plaintiff's [1] - 122:14 **Plan** [1] - 106:13 plan [1] - 130:21 planning [1] - 11:4 plans [1] - 18:3 pleased [1] - 7:17 plucking [1] - 55:12 point [30] - 11:2, 13:19, 17:13, 33:19, 41:10, 51:21, 52:18, 56:8, 60:17, 68:10, 69:2, 69:7, 69:9, 87:24, 93:18, 94:1, 94:19, 94:24, 95:2, 95:3, 95:5, 95:25, 96:1, 102:18, 107:23, 114:14, 132:16, 134:15, 134:24, 143:17 pointed [1] - 95:7 pointes [1] - 26:25 points [4] - 68:21, 96:4, 118:10, 136:17 police [2] - 81:22, 123:3

Police [4] - 36:17, 86:1, 115:7, 115:22 policies [1] - 59:5 Policy [5] - 40:22, 50:6, 50:16, 60:10, 71.25 policy [8] - 41:4, 41:5, 41:11, 49:20, 50:10, 50:20, 50:22, 51:2 poorly [1] - 55:16 popliteal [1] - 94:22 **population** [1] - 30:10 populations [1] -20:25 portend [1] - 21:5 portion [5] - 14:19, 15:1, 15:2, 64:14, 120:8 portions [2] - 128:10, 134:16 position [6] - 10:25, 128:14, 129:11, 129:15, 133:14, 134:22 positions [2] - 120:3, 136:18 positive [1] - 101:24 possess [1] - 125:14 possessed [1] -125:11 possession[1] -103:22 possible [5] - 15:9, 26:1, 37:20, 89:11, 89:19 possibly [1] - 90:2 post [3] - 10:11, 15:14, 62:14 post-aesthetically [1] - 62:14 post-operative [1] -15:14 post-operatively [1] -10:11 posterior [1] - 86:4 postherpetic [1] -30:5 postmortem [15] -61:17, 62:1, 62:4, 62:25, 63:17, 65:16, 81:24, 84:24, 85:1, 86:1, 86:10, 95:2, 100:18, 102:12, 116:20 posture [1] - 131:8 potency [2] - 24:4, 28:8 potent [9] - 24:1, 24:3, 24:7, 28:19, 28:21, 29:2, 29:3

potential [8] - 26:3, 27:9, 55:23, 123:1, 125:17, 125:20, 126:2 potentially [4] - 64:9, 122:16. 123:20. 123:22 practice [81] - 4:7, 5:10, 6:1, 8:18, 13:9, 13:20, 13:22, 14:3, 14:19, 15:1, 15:2, 15:3, 17:10, 19:11, 20:10, 23:6, 29:25, 32:6, 33:4, 33:16, 33:25, 38:16, 39:2, 39:12, 39:15, 39:17, 40:6, 40:9, 42:9, 42:15, 42:20, 42:21, 42:25, 43:2, 43:3, 44:1, 45:6, 45:17, 46:5, 47:25, 48:4, 49:3, 51:15, 52:15, 55:24, 57:2, 57:10, 57:13, 59:15, 65:4, 65:24, 67:19, 67:21, 67:23, 68:3, 68:4, 75:17, 76:2, 76:3, 77:19, 77:20, 78:16, 79:5, 82:1, 82:21, 83:3, 83:7, 86:9, 86:14, 86:21, 86:25, 87:24, 89:6, 93:1, 93:19, 98:14, 117:12, 121:16, 134:3 Practice [1] - 16:8 practiced [2] - 13:16, 83:25 practicing [5] - 20:12, 50:23, 52:14, 64:4, 79:12 practitioner [9] -24:15, 45:8, 45:16, 45:19, 48:1, 48:3, 49:2, 49:5, 65:21 pre [4] - 124:21, 124:24, 124:25, 141:17 pre-affidavit [1] -141:17 pre-trial [3] - 124:21, 124:24, 124:25 preceded [1] - 57:11 precedent [1] - 123:17 preceding [1] - 91:15 precise [3] - 85:14, 101:9, 114:15 precisely [4] - 20:9, 60:24, 79:18, 95:25 preclude [3] - 5:19,

124:21, 124:24 Preclude [1] - 5:21 Prednisone [1] -109:10 predominantly [1] -29.12 prefer [2] - 89:18, 89:21 pregnancy [1] -110:16 preliminary [19] -131:10, 131:14, 132:7, 132:12, 132:18, 136:12, 137:5, 137:13, 137:19, 139:3, 139:21, 141:21, 141:24, 141:25, 142:5, 142:20, 142:23, 143:19 premature [1] - 73:21 prepared [4] - 3:19, 6:16, 140:1, 146:11 preparing [1] - 127:22 preponderance [1] -142:13 Presbyterian [2] - 9:7, 9:16 prescribe [6] - 22:21, 42:1, 42:9, 82:12, 82:17, 82:18 prescribed [9] - 18:17, 24:22, 35:13, 54:16, 57:20, 63:17, 93:2, 121:15, 124:20 prescriber [3] - 21:6, 49:7, 81:5 Prescribing [3] -44:20, 50:24, 72:2 prescribing [63] -18:13, 18:16, 18:24, 19:9, 19:24, 20:16, 20:18, 20:21, 21:4, 23:10, 24:12, 24:15, 24:20, 25:1, 27:12, 32:5, 39:1, 39:4, 39:13, 40:17, 41:2, 41:8, 41:16, 41:18, 41:22, 42:8, 42:18, 42:21, 43:16, 44:17, 45:18, 45:19, 46:7, 49:4, 51:6, 51:7, 51:17, 53:13, 54:13, 56:16, 56:18, 56:19, 57:16, 58:5, 59:7, 60:7, 60:18, 63:18, 64:6, 68:2, 71:7, 81:2, 81:5, 81:8, 96:17, 115:14, 116:21, 117:10,

121:17, 124:13, 136:2 Prescription [4] -35:24, 58:18, 58:20, 58:24 prescription [43] -23:3, 33:23, 34:2, 34:8, 40:7, 45:3, 45:4, 45:9, 45:14, 45:20, 45:21, 45:23, 45:25, 46:5, 46:10, 46:24, 47:18, 47:20, 47:22, 48:19, 49:1, 49:9, 49:13, 53:15, 57:6, 57:11, 58:14, 58:22, 63:4, 63:5, 63:7, 63:19, 65:20, 79:18, 79:19, 83:2, 101:18, 112:23, 113:6, 113:8, 113:10, 115:15, 116:19 prescriptions [16] -4:5, 4:9, 5:9, 5:25, 33:3, 33:14, 33:17, 35:12, 40:18, 43:3, 52:14, 65:20, 65:22, 66:3, 113:3, 135:4 Prescriptions [2] -47:10, 71:24 presence [3] - 65:17, 96:14, 138:15 present [7] - 54:14, 54:15, 54:16, 75:14, 118:20, 120:14, 128:13 presentation [5] -3:15, 61:2, 61:19, 88:17, 129:17 presentations [3] -21:23, 22:7, 76:14 presented [5] - 61:15, 82:19, 82:24, 82:25, 120:23 presenting[1]-132:24 presents [1] - 54:14 President [1] - 75:14 pressed [1] - 5:13 pressure [3] - 30:7, 62:12, 110:5 presumably [1] -102:10 presume [1] - 59:8 pretty [1] - 118:5 prevent[1] - 129:13 previous [1] - 59:5 previously [7] - 5:21, 26:13, 31:3, 31:7,

31:12, 32:25, 49:12

primarily [4] - 16:25, 17:12, 19:24, 19:25 primary [13] - 65:14, 77:19, 77:21, 77:22, 77:25, 78:5, 79:10, 79:11, 79:15, 79:17, 82:8, 82:22, 83:2 principles [5] - 5:3, 5:4, 34:5, 57:14, 67:23 private [1] - 14:3 privileges [3] - 77:25, 83:17, 83:23 probability [3] - 57:18, 57:19, 57:20 Probable [11] - 120:7, 120:16, 125:18, 126:22, 127:1, 127:25, 133:1, 133:3, 135:15, 135:23, 138:18 probable [17] - 72:24, 73:3, 120:9, 123:4, 123:21. 123:23. 123:24, 126:3, 139:12, 141:7, 142:9, 142:15, 142:17, 144:3, 144:13, 144:16 problem [11] - 18:6, 20:19, 20:22, 21:15, 51:23, 52:7, 52:8, 71:2, 81:19, 138:5, 144:22 problematic [5] - 21:5, 41:8, 53:9, 64:4, 65:5 problems [5] - 17:7, 21:4, 22:3, 30:4, 117:8 procedural [1] -101:11 procedurally [1] -72:23 procedure [1] - 138:14 procedures [1] - 10:4 proceed [11] - 6:9, 6:16, 72:21, 129:22, 131:1, 142:22, 142:24, 143:18, 144:10, 144:13, 145:18 proceeding [3] - 3:15, 73:2, 143:23 Proceedings [1] -1:21 PROCEEDINGS [1] proceedings [2] -145:20, 146:8

process [9] - 52:17, 52:18, 55:12, 90:8, 91:7, 94:10, 97:6, 135:12, 143:21 processes [1] - 97:7 produce [1] - 62:20 produced [1] - 1:21 produces [1] - 62:12 producing [1] - 95:12 profession [1] - 59:24 professional [33] -4:7, 4:13, 5:10, 6:1, 18:18, 19:11, 19:17, 23:6, 32:6, 33:4, 33:16, 33:25, 38:16, 39:2, 39:12, 39:15, 40:9, 42:19, 45:6, 45:17, 45:22, 46:20, 47:25, 49:3, 52:15, 57:13, 65:4, 65:24, 74:15, 74:17, 117:12, 121:16, 134:3 Professional [1] -18:11 professionalism [1] -46.16 proffer [3] - 135:7, 137:24, 138:15 progeny [1] - 128:17 program [4] - 10:23, 12:10, 58:14, 58:25 **Program** [5] - 17:16, 17:19, 58:19, 58:20, 58:24 programs [1] - 23:2 progress [5] - 107:15, 108:2, 108:20, 109:3, 109:6 progressively [2] -20:22, 63:6 prohibited [1] - 68:1 prolix [1] - 123:2 prolongation [1] -26:24 prolonged [1] -113:22 promptly [1] - 127:5 **proof** [5] - 3:15, 132:1, 139:5, 139:10, 139:15 proper [2] - 45:17, 49:4 properly [1] - 128:17 property [1] - 127:23 proportionality [1] -135:3 propose [2] - 73:2, 119:15

proposition [1] -

122:25 propriety [1] - 33:2 pros [1] - 44:7 prosecution [3] -76:22, 76:25, 123:25 Prosecution [2] -31:21, 31:22 protected [1] - 64:18 protocols [1] - 38:20 prove [2] - 122:25, 126:20 provide [12] - 7:25, 24:10, 30:20, 30:22, 59:18, 62:21, 82:25, 84:13, 90:21, 139:9, 139:15, 140:12 provided [24] - 7:5, 12:5, 12:8, 19:22, 30:17, 32:12, 33:13, 33:23, 35:8, 37:21, 38:7, 46:1, 61:11, 70:4, 89:24, 103:2, 105:20, 106:9, 107:7, 108:6, 109:2, 120:21, 140:12, 141:23 providers [1] - 23:7 provides [4] - 43:7, 54:8, 54:12, 64:4 providing [3] - 11:24, 19:19, 93:23 provision [5] - 10:8, 10:15, 15:3, 20:1, 38:22 provisions [2] - 46:2, 146:5

prudent [1] - 128:5

psychological [7] -

psoriatic [1] - 109:10

12:12, 15:17, 38:12,

38:13, 55:18, 58:2

Psychology [1] - 9:3

51:23, 52:3, 52:7,

public [6] - 51:19,

52:8, 55:24

Public [1] - 32:2

publications [15] -

80:1, 80:4, 80:7,

79:21, 79:22, 79:25,

80:10, 80:12, 80:15,

80:19, 80:22, 81:9,

81:14, 84:22, 85:1

published [5] - 40:24,

41:14, 41:23, 42:5,

pull [2] - 20:7, 93:10

pulmonary [1] - 62:6

pumps [2] - 14:22,

pulls [1] - 62:12

80:3

15:12

Q

puncture [1] - 94:19

purport [3] - 120:11,

purported [1] - 45:25

purporting [3] - 45:21,

purports [2] - 120:20,

121:11, 122:18

121:14, 121:18

Purpose [1] - 48:22

purpose [31] - 6:1,

19:10, 23:3, 32:5,

33:15, 33:24, 39:2,

39:5, 39:11, 39:14,

40:8, 42:19, 45:3,

45:5, 45:15, 47:25,

49:2, 49:9, 55:4,

57:12, 65:3, 87:6,

116:9, 117:11,

120:14, 121:2,

127:17, 129:17

purposes [9] - 4:7,

120:11. 134:4

5:11, 33:5, 52:16,

65:25, 66:7, 72:15,

pursuant [4] - 120:13,

pursue [2] - 123:20,

124:3

121:18, 133:4, 146:5

put [17] - 30:16, 41:18,

73:8, 84:6, 84:14,

93:14, 110:21,

116:18, 120:20,

133:3, 135:14,

135:21, 136:4,

putative [1] - 38:25

putting [2] - 37:17,

puts [1] - 139:4

140:17

120:8

125:2, 125:3, 129:6,

95:22, 97:15, 99:13,

125:2

QT [4] - 26:24, 80:22, 80:25, 81:9 qualifications [1] -102:20 qualified [10] - 3:17, 4:17, 4:20, 4:25, 5:7, 33:1, 124:19, 125:2, 126:11 quality [1] - 103:5 **quantities** [1] - 54:14 quantity [2] - 12:22, 95:23 quantum [1] - 133:9 questioning [1] - 6:10 questions [5] - 52:20, 72:16, 87:17, 117:1,

118:6
quickly [1] - 129:7
quite [2] - 113:23,
134:17
quote [1] - 142:2
quoted [1] - 142:19

R

raised [5] - 97:23,
97:25, 98:17, 116
136:16

97:25, 98:17, 116:5, raises [1] - 131:15 ran [2] - 12:6, 12:9 random [1] - 87:12 randomized [2] -86:16, 87:2 range [13] - 62:20, 69:1, 92:20, 92:24, 95:10, 96:13, 96:21, 99:24, 100:1, 111:9, 114:23, 115:2 rank [1] - 11:12 rapid [1] - 114:25 rapidly [1] - 97:24 rarely [4] - 42:12, 42:14, 56:14, 60:23 rate [2] - 51:24, 51:25 rather [5] - 129:7, 137:4, 137:11, 137:14, 140:8 **Raymond** [1] - 5:18 Re [1] - 1:9 re [4] - 16:1, 44:4, 78:13 re-certified [2] - 16:1, 78:13 re-established [1] -78:13 re-evaluate [1] - 44:4 reach [3] - 61:17, 65:10, 65:21 reached [6] - 44:22, 47:2, 48:10, 60:16, 66:1, 70:5 reaching [10] - 36:24, 40:2, 44:21, 47:1, 48:9. 49:18. 51:3. 60:15, 61:11, 70:5 read [23] - 25:3, 25:8, 26:4, 26:23, 37:11, 43:25, 45:11, 48:25, 54:24, 67:15, 77:2, 78:9, 81:13, 81:17, 92:11, 101:5, 101:12, 101:19,

104:10, 105:10,

106:23, 107:18

readily [1] - 123:18

reading [1] - 60:12

reads [1] - 118:15 ready [4] - 6:9, 74:7, 131:18 real [1] - 96:10 realized [1] - 13:5 really [4] - 77:5, 88:15, 130:6, 136:23 realm [3] - 51:10, 58:12, 67:21 **REALTIME** [1] - 1:24 reason [7] - 21:25, 59:20, 67:3, 92:14, 116:8, 119:22, 142:24 reasonable [7] -54:14, 55:10, 71:11, 71:13. 123:21. 135:23, 135:25 reasonableness [1] -124:5 reasonably [1] - 59:8 reasons [3] - 4:24, 5:19, 10:24 rebuttal [1] - 141:23 receive [2] - 3:7, 130:13 received [1] - 121:19 receiving [4] - 27:3, 106:20, 106:25, 107:23 recent [3] - 49:25, 50:1, 50:2 receptors [2] - 28:4 recess [2] - 72:19, 131:6 recipe [1] - 87:25 recitation [2] - 126:14, 135:4 reckless [5] - 120:17, 126:24, 136:7, 142:6, 142:12 recklessly [7] -120:16, 120:18, 121:11, 122:19, 124:16, 126:4, 139:5 reckoning [1] - 38:5 recognize [2] - 50:3, 69:23 Recognizing [1] -124:3 recollection [2] -34:18, 36:1 recommendations [2] - 37:16, 68:14 recommended [1] -37:18 record [18] - 6:23. 19:20. 37:11. 61:22. 66:7, 92:5, 99:21,

105:3, 106:6, 107:5,

107:14, 108:1, 108:19, 118:21, 125:7, 133:17, 141:3, 143:6 recorded [1] - 1:21 records [48] - 33:13, 34:15, 34:20, 35:8, 36:1, 36:6, 36:9, 36:12, 36:14, 36:23, 37:1, 37:12, 41:3, 41:4, 44:11, 59:14, 60:8, 61:11, 65:8, 79:14, 81:18, 81:21, 88:5, 88:12, 89:11, 89:13, 89:19, 90:2, 90:10, 90:11, 90:13, 90:15, 90:18, 90:20, 90:21, 90:24, 90:25, 92:2, 92:4, 92:8, 92:10, 92:13, 92:19, 104:17, 112:17, 115:10, 129:12 recovery [1] - 10:11 red [1] - 59:17 redirect [1] - 116:25 **REDIRECT** [1] - 117:2 redistribution [2] -84:24, 85:2 refer [10] - 7:4, 37:3, 66:5, 68:7, 82:21, 83:2, 120:24, 121:23, 121:25, 122.2 reference [1] - 96:21 **Reference** [1] - 25:2 referenced[1] - 72:5 referral [2] - 15:13, 15:17 referrals [1] - 12:7 referred [2] - 50:1, 114:22 referring [6] - 85:7, 93:12, 122:1, 124:9, 133:20, 133:21 refers [1] - 28:2 refused [1] - 125:15 regard [1] - 132:16 regarding [14] - 5:14, 12:13, 16:5, 16:15, 19:17, 27:14, 34:16, 36:18, 54:25, 58:5, 61:12, 65:10, 73:4, 104:9 region [2] - 11:11, 67:13 Regional [1] - 74:21 regional [2] - 9:12, 10.4 regular [1] - 14:7 regularly [2] - 53:15,

54:15 regulated [1] - 33:25 Regulations [1] - 45:7 regulations [3] - 34:2, 38:21, 131:4 Rehabilitation [1] -12.9 rehabilitative [1] -15:3 reinstate [1] - 63:12 reiterated [1] - 125:25 rejected [2] - 5:6, 122:14 rejecting [1] - 125:15 relate [2] - 126:15, 127:1 related [6] - 18:1, 35:2, 42:17, 52:5, 80:11, 81:10 relating [1] - 46:2 relationship [3] - 34:4, 133:2, 135:18 relative [3] - 37:16, 88:21, 113:20 relatively [9] - 63:20, 68:4, 98:18, 112:18, 112:21, 113:21, 113:24, 115:20, 129:7 release [2] - 59:13, 97:7 relevance [1] - 127:6 relevancy [1] - 73:12 relevant [5] - 126:9, 126:11, 126:18, 127:5, 128:6 reliability [1] - 102:21 reliable [4] - 5:3, 103:8, 103:9, 139:16 reliably [1] - 5:4 reliance [1] - 123:8 relied [8] - 39:24, 71:21, 90:21, 90:23, 91:22, 122:10, 123:13, 123:16 reluctant [1] - 73:22 rely [14] - 6:6, 30:22, 30:25, 40:1, 42:25, 43:3, 43:20, 44:19, 46:25, 48:8, 49:17, 51:2, 56:18, 70:4 remain [1] - 78:24 remaining [2] -139:11, 142:14 remember [2] - 13:7, 67:10 removed [1] - 23:15 render [3] - 3:18, 66:21, 123:3

rendered [2] - 31:23,

32:6 rendering [3] - 10:9, 42:25, 43:2 repeat [1] - 13:10 repeated [1] - 47:24 repeatedly [2] - 33:6, 67:15 repeats [1] - 118:21 repetitive [1] - 37:13 report [44] - 34:21, 34:22, 35:2, 35:5, 35:23, 60:12, 66:9, 66:12, 71:16, 71:17, 81:17, 84:7, 84:12, 84:13, 84:14, 86:1, 86:7, 90:12, 90:22, 92:1, 92:3, 92:6, 92:9, 92:10, 99:5, 99:8, 99:10, 99:12, 99:13, 100:9, 100:18, 100:22, 101:5, 101:8, 101:15, 103:10, 104:4, 104:22, 110:18, 110:23, 112:13, 115:8, 115:9 Report [1] - 35:24 REPORTED [1] -146:15 reported [8] - 25:9, 27:3, 95:10, 96:10, 96:23, 101:22, 101:24, 114:23 Reporter [3] - 146:3, 146:14, 146:17 **REPORTER** [2] - 1:24, 13:10 reporter [1] - 146:23 reports [12] - 3:25, 4:3, 36:17, 66:4, 66:15, 71:9, 81:22, 89:1, 89:5, 89:7, 103:2. 117:21 represent [2] - 55:19, 91:15 representations [1] -133:10 representative [1] -127:10 represented [1] -41:25 represents [4] - 42:7, 59:25, 93:15, 134:10 reproduction [1] -146:22 request [5] - 140:10, 141:2, 141:4, 142:10, 144:24 requests [1] - 145:12 require [5] - 23:9,

123:24, 125:19, 131:4, 132:5 required [7] - 14:13, 24:16, 46:23, 123:22, 125:18, 136:11, 142:1 requirement [2] -58:21, 131:12 requirements [1] -45.8 requires [6] - 55:22, 122:15, 131:9, 141:21, 142:9, 143:18 requiring [1] - 139:4 requisite [3] - 47:20, 129:1, 132:7 research [1] - 45:23 reserve [1] - 11:5 Reserve [1] - 9:1 residency [11] - 9:8, 9:11, 9:22, 10:21, 74:24, 74:25, 75:2, 75:6, 75:8, 78:5, 84:2 Resident [5] - 9:13, 10:19, 10:21, 10:22, 10:25 resident [2] - 9:24, 74:20 residents [2] - 10:23, 11:24 resolve [1] - 123:23 resources [1] - 144:5 respect [7] - 3:7, 3:16, 20:3, 51:17, 73:12, 119:24, 128:23 respective[1] -136:18 respiratory [3] - 25:9, 26:5, 26:7 respire [1] - 96:7 respond [3] - 89:15, 143:16, 145:11 responded [1] - 90:7 responding [2] - 38:3, 57:4 response [3] - 5:21, 6:7, 141:10 responses [1] -134.14 responsibilities [1] -46:20 responsibility [8] -45:17, 45:19, 46:3, 46:11, 46:15, 49:3,

49:5, 59:7

responsible [7] -

33:20, 34:1, 34:5,

41:15, 46:9, 52:11,

57:14 Responsible [1] -50:24 restoration [2] -12:10, 15:16 rests [2] - 45:20, 49:5 result [3] - 5:3, 123:2, 123.8 resulting [1] - 101:16 retained [2] - 31:23, 32:4 return [4] - 12:14, 18:2, 73:17, 97:11 returned [2] - 11:17, 95:17 returning [1] - 145:3 revealed [1] - 62:1 reverse [1] - 92:14 review [32] - 34:24, 35:2, 35:5, 35:8, 35:12, 35:15, 35:18, 35:23, 36:4, 36:12, 36:15, 36:17, 36:20, 71:3, 79:14, 88:4, 89:11, 89:13, 89:22, 104:17, 105:20, 105:25, 106:10, 107:8, 108:7, 110:21, 117:21, 118:20, 119:5, 126:25, 131:25, 143:1 reviewed [39] - 19:8, 34:16, 34:18, 34:19, 34:20, 34:21, 35:20, 36:3, 36:24, 41:13, 65:8, 76:16, 80:4, 80:7, 80:10, 80:15, 86:21, 90:22, 91:4, 91:6, 91:9, 91:12, 91:17, 92:2, 92:4, 92:6, 92:9, 92:18, 92:21, 99:7, 99:16, 104:23, 106:2, 114:17, 115:7, 115:8, 115:9, 115:10 reviewer [1] - 91:21 reviewers [1] - 91:7 reviewing [6] - 19:18, 19:20, 36:1, 36:10, 95:1, 112:17 reviews [2] - 76:7, 77:7 revised [1] - 50:8 revisions [1] - 49:24 Richard [1] - 4:22 rigor [2] - 86:2, 86:3 **ripe** [1] - 77:2 risk [28] - 27:10, 53:22, 54:3, 55:19,

57:16, 57:18, 58:3, 58:6, 58:12, 60:1, 63:11, 63:25, 64:1, 64:2, 64:19, 64:23, 68:21, 68:23, 69:3, 69:9, 69:10, 69:16, 69:17, 69:18, 69:19, 99:21, 137:21 riskier [4] - 53:23, 53:25, 58:8, 58:10 risks [2] - 67:20, 70:1 risky [2] - 56:12, 65:2 **RMR** [1] - 1:23 RMR,CRR [2] -146:13, 146:16 **ROBERT**[1] - 1:10 Rock [1] - 8:25 Roger [1] - 42:6 room [3] - 11:23, 131:7, 141:1 roots [1] - 14:25 rose [2] - 11:12, 55:12 **Ross** [2] - 84:16, 97:13 rotated [1] - 75:7 rotating [1] - 9:20 rotations [1] - 10:2 roughly [4] - 28:15, 28:16, 28:24, 113:17 rounds [1] - 21:13 routine [1] - 93:20 routinely [1] - 43:20 Roxane [1] - 24:20 Rule [1] - 102:25 rule [3] - 103:12, 122:22, 130:12 ruling [6] - 136:15, 136:21, 137:15, 138:1. 138:3. 138:4 rumentarium [1] -23:18 running [1] - 14:2

S

s/Kristin [1] - 146:13 **SA's** [1] - 84:6 safe [4] - 39:3, 55:3, 68:15, 68:16 safest [1] - 68:23 salting [1] - 25:21 Santyl [2] - 106:20, 108:22 satisfactory [1] -53:11 saw [3] - 29:17, 56:3, 103:3 scar [1] - 109:14 scenario [4] - 60:1, 88:18, 88:20, 89:12

118:19

66:25

64:15

sedatives [2] - 16:18,

see [28] - 17:8, 17:9,

17:10, 17:14, 18:10,

25:13, 31:25, 44:13,

scenarios [2] - 93:3, 93.5 scene [1] - 36:21 Schedule [1] - 22:17 scheduled [1] -134.17 school [2] - 9:5, 9:7 School [1] - 9:5 scientific [3] - 51:14, 67:23, 103:6 scope [2] - 34:3, 144:7 **SCRANTON** [2] - 1:11, 1.25 Scranton 131 - 1:15. 1:19, 146:19 screen [5] - 54:11, 54:12, 100:12. 110:15, 110:20 screened [1] - 101:9 screening [3] - 54:6, 54:8, 58:13 screens [1] - 110:24 seal [2] - 120:21, 133:8 search [16] - 3:11, 35:19, 72:23, 121:1, 121:5, 121:9, 123:7, 124:11, 125:19, 126:23, 127:23, 132:22, 141:6, 141:7. 142:15. 142:16 searched [1] - 124:18 seated [1] - 7:1 **second** [6] - 3:10, 26:4, 34:22, 47:12, 47:13, 104:6 secondarily [3] - 39:6, 73:10 secondary [3] - 17:25, 63:10, 65:17 Secours [1] - 36:12 Section [13] - 43:22, 44:21, 44:24, 45:12, 47:10, 47:17, 47:22, 48:22, 49:17, 60:6, 71:24, 72:2, 146:6 section [11] - 44:19,

46:3, 47:12, 48:23, 54:6, 60:24, 69:8, 71:4, 73:19, 75:22, 82:5, 94:4, 105:13, 112:3, 115:22, 117:16, 118:12, 127:15, 128:14, 133:22 seeing [3] - 14:7, 113:12, 118:17 seek [1] - 3:17 seeking [3] - 54:2, 142:25, 143:19 **segment** [2] - 34:5, 57:14 seizure [1] - 3:11 selected [2] - 10:23, 55:16 selection [2] - 54:19, 57:22 send [1] - 14:24 sense [4] - 29:11, 34:17, 36:23, 77:14 sent [2] - 50:21, 90:18 sentence [2] - 55:1, 110:13 separate [3] - 34:20, 95:7, 137:23 **separately** [1] - 95:20 **September** [9] - 35:10, 63:5, 66:12, 71:17, 89:3, 92:15, 104:21, 113:3, 119:1 **sequential** [1] - 40:25 serious [1] - 26:25 serve [1] - 132:2 service [3] - 12:7, 106:7, 108:2 **Services** [1] - 11:13 services [9] - 11:25, 12:3, 12:8, 12:19, 13:3, 14:11, 15:4, 30:22 serving [1] - 11:15 set [8] - 34:20, 34:21, 34:22, 61:16, 71:6, 90:25, 142:14, 146:9 setting [11] - 10:11, 45:11, 45:24, 46:25, 16:21, 17:13, 22:15, 48:6, 48:8, 49:8, 46:6, 63:1, 95:10, 73:3, 99:22, 109:14, 95:13, 96:16, 97:2 seven [7] - 11:21, 76:6, 76:11, 82:1, sections [1] - 51:9 113:5, 113:6, 113:15 sedative [2] - 62:19, **Seventh** [2] - 125:22,

125:24

several [4] - 21:2,

shall [1] - 45:25

shaping [1] - 123:9

32:18, 68:21, 137:25

shocked [2] - 134:16, 134:21 shoe [1] - 70:17 short [4] - 28:15, 74:6, 115:1, 140:17 **shorter** [1] - 122:13 shortest [2] - 68:20, 114:24 shorthand [1] - 1:21 show [8] - 102:5, 112:2, 121:11, 122:5, 126:4, 126:23, 129:17, 131:21 showed [3] - 62:18, 65:17, 102:8 showing [6] - 132:7, 132:12, 132:18, 136:12, 139:3, 142:5 **shown** [1] - 137:3 shows [1] - 109:21 **side** [2] - 26:2, 142:14 sides [1] - 136:16 sign [1] - 134:3 signals [1] - 17:4 signatories [1] - 50:15 signatory [3] - 41:8, 50:10, 50:18 signature [4] - 101:2, 105:6, 105:13, 105:14 signed [1] - 100:23 significant [4] - 118:2, 128:25, 136:17 signs [2] - 106:15, 135:12 similar [5] - 4:24, 5:19, 19:7, 25:24, 31:14 similarly [1] - 66:13 simple [1] - 39:7 simply [17] - 30:2, 39:9, 59:8, 59:10, 73:8, 75:6, 81:12, 87:5, 95:9, 95:16, 96:19, 116:18, 125:5, 132:23, 133:16, 136:19, 136:20 simultaneously [1] -95:21 single [3] - 96:11, 96:19, 100:10 single-drug [1] -96:11 sit [2] - 73:14, 135:20 sites [1] - 95:21 sitting [1] - 86:5 **Six** [1] - 76:8

six [4] - 76:10, 107:18,

122:9, 133:22 skin [1] - 106:21 skipped [4] - 118:2, 118:4, 118:7, 131:11 sleeping [1] - 107:20 sleepy [1] - 16:19 slightly [1] - 28:7 Slippery [1] - 8:25 Slizewski [1] - 125:21 slow [1] - 25:20 small [2] - 13:24, 110:2 **smoking** [1] - 58:1 snatch [1] - 67:4 so-called [1] - 114:25 **SOAP**[4] - 106:12, 107:10, 107:16, 108:24 Society [5] - 17:15, 17:20, 18:8, 41:24, 42:6 **solo** [1] - 14:3 solvent [2] - 81:15, 81:19 **somatic** [1] - 93:5 someone [7] - 24:22, 53:5, 55:16, 70:8, 70:18, 98:8, 110:19 **somewhat** [1] - 127:9 sorry [28] - 13:11, 18:19, 19:11, 27:18, 29:2, 32:2, 45:12, 67:2, 76:9, 78:19, 93:25, 94:6, 96:13, 101:1, 101:23, 103:5, 103:13, 106:23, 108:12, 110:13, 112:14, 113:3, 116:7, 116:10, 130:11, 130:17, 139:24, 143:24 sought [2] - 4:23, 5:18 sound [2] - 85:18, 93:6 source [3] - 94:21, 94:22, 95:18 sources [7] - 38:8, 40:15, 40:20, 88:5, 88:6, 88:8, 91:21 spaces [1] - 110:1 **spasticity** [2] - 13:7, 13:13 special [2] - 23:9, 23:10 **specialized** [1] - 103:6 specialty [5] - 9:25, 10:14, 16:24, 77:20, 79:4 **specific** [8] - 22:4,

91:8, 92:17, 99:15, 99:16, 132:17, 133:23, 134:16 specifically [22] -3:16, 10:8, 10:14, 20:15, 21:20, 21:23, 22:17. 22:19. 23:2. 24:17. 33:11. 33:12. 43:12, 66:18, 70:11, 93:12, 93:13, 103:4, 114:18, 117:14, 120:7, 139:8 specificity [1] - 139:9 spectral [2] - 101:17, 102:4 **spell** [1] - 6:22 spend [1] - 73:22 spent [1] - 49:24 spike [1] - 23:13 spinal [19] - 13:6, 13:12, 14:21, 14:23, 14:24, 28:5, 29:16, 29:20, 109:23, 109:24, 109:25. 110:2, 110:3, 110:4, 110:6, 110:9, 110:10 spoken [1] - 133:23 spouses [1] - 138:21 **spread** [2] - 52:2, 52:3 **Spruce** [1] - 1:18 **stable** [1] - 68:4 Staff [2] - 11:9, 11:18 staff [3] - 14:10, 14:11 stand [4] - 71:9, 112:6, 120:10, 125:2 standard [20] - 18:17, 33:7, 33:16, 33:17, 33:18, 33:19, 33:23, 34:7, 34:10, 38:20, 38:24, 40:9, 40:11, 47:3, 56:20, 57:1, 79:12, 82:20 standards [7] - 18:24, 20:10, 44:17, 68:3, 79:17, 87:20 standing [21] - 73:7, 128:20, 128:21, 128:22, 129:2, 129:6, 129:11, 129:12, 129:23, 130:3, 130:8, 130:12, 130:14, 130:16, 130:23, 131:1, 132:10, 137:10, 140:5 standpoint [1] -131:20 stands [1] - 20:7 Stanford [2] - 9:5, 11:4

star [1] - 20:13 start [7] - 8:23, 25:20, 25:23, 25:24, 34:23, 56:3. 56:4 started [2] - 12:24, 78:17 State [19] - 4:18, 8:25, 18:11, 18:15, 19:14, 19:17, 31:10, 36:17, 40:22, 41:7, 50:6, 50:12, 50:16, 50:20, 51:1, 60:9, 86:1, 115:7, 115:22 state [11] - 6:22, 26:22, 49:22, 50:13, 52:9, 64:8, 70:12, 92:4, 101:5, 139:10, 141:3 statement [9] - 6:13, 40:5, 41:22, 134:7, 134:11, 134:12, 139:19, 142:5, 142:8 statements [12] -120:15, 120:17, 120:22, 120:24, 121:19, 126:5, 127:24, 131:21, 136:8, 139:5, 139:17, 144:18 states [5] - 40:17, 50:14, 50:15, 50:17, 68:18 **STATES**[3] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:12 States [26] - 1:13, 3:5, 3:22, 4:22, 5:18, 6:18, 7:3, 8:1, 11:7, 11:8, 47:10, 50:15, 51:19, 66:10, 71:24, 79:13, 121:24, 123:11, 125:8, 125:21, 126:22, 139:7, 139:17, 146:4, 146:6, 146:17 stating [1] - 122:12 stay [2] - 7:8, 129:20 staying [2] - 54:18, 130:4 stays [1] - 24:4 steady [1] - 26:22 step [3] - 19:16, 119:13, 143:21 **Stephen** [6] - 3:10, 3:23, 4:12, 6:19, 6:24, 7:16 STEPHEN [1] - 6:24 steroid [1] - 109:11 still [6] - 17:8, 40:21,

77:10, 87:5, 88:2,

98:12

stimulation [1] - 28:4 stimulators [2] -14:23, 15:12 **stop** [3] - 9:15, 62:9, 116:6 stopped [1] - 67:12 straight [1] - 112:7 stratification [1] -53:22 street [1] - 125:5 Street [1] - 1:18 **Strike** [1] - 19:3 strike [1] - 98:9 strong [2] - 87:8, 87:12 **structured** [1] - 88:15 studies [5] - 86:21, 87:11, 87:12, 99:8 study [3] - 99:16, 100:16, 100:17 **stuff** [1] - 143:10 **stupid** [1] - 93:7 subject [2] - 46:1, 85:5 **subjective**[1] - 105:11 Subjective [1] -106:13 subjects [3] - 80:1, 80:14, 80:16 submit [11] - 3:19, 91:14, 138:9, 140:15, 143:2, 143:11, 144:21, 144:23, 145:2, 145:3, 145:5 submits [1] - 145:10 submitted [8] - 134:2, 138:10, 140:14, 141:4. 141:11. 141:13, 143:2, 144:17 **submitting** [1] - 121:6 Subsection [3] -45:12, 47:13 subsection [2] -47:14, 48:25 subsequent [3] - 11:2, 123:25, 144:24 subspecialties [1] -75:8 subspecialty [6] -4:15, 8:16, 10:7, 11:25, 15:8, 15:25 Substance [2] - 48:15, 78:8 substance [13] -45:14, 46:24, 49:1, 52:21, 52:24, 53:13, 54:1, 56:23, 57:25, 61:22, 63:10, 102:22

substances [33] -16:12. 16:16. 16:17. 16:20. 18:16. 19:25. 20:1, 20:16, 20:18, 20:21, 20:23, 20:24, 21:4, 22:1, 22:18, 43:17, 44:2, 44:9, 45:18, 46:2, 49:4, 52:6, 57:17, 57:21, 58:5, 58:25, 59:7, 59:20, 61:24, 79:6, 79:8, 79:18, 79:20 substantial [2] - 79:5, 142:4 substantiating [1] -138:13 substantive [1] -97:17 successful [1] - 124:1 sudden [1] - 61:15 Sudden [1] - 81:9 suffering [1] - 15:18 sufficient [3] - 5:2, 123:20, 144:16 suggest [3] - 73:9, 136:24, 136:25 **suggested** [1] - 120:8 suggesting [1] -130:22 suggests [1] - 55:25 Suite [1] - 3:11 summoned [1] - 127:7 superior [2] - 94:20, 97:11 supervision [2] -146:11, 146:23 supplement [1] -143:6 supplemental [1] -104:22 supplemented [1] -5.21 supplied [1] - 99:4 support [12] - 6:7, 15:17, 40:1, 99:5, 99:9, 110:8, 136:17, 138:18, 139:12, 141:2, 141:4, 144:17 **supported** [1] - 5:1 supposed [2] - 25:3, 102:19 **Suppress** [2] - 3:11, 119:24 suppression [4] -69:20, 73:16, 137:18, 144:4 Supreme [3] - 123:9,

Substances [7] - 16:8,

16:13, 19:13, 19:14,

40:12, 44:21, 72:3

123:17, 142:2 surely [1] - 103:18 surgical [1] - 10:9 surrounding [2] -3:24, 110:7 suspect [1] - 143:6 suspect's [1] - 123:23 sustained [2] - 114:9, 116:12 Suzanne [1] - 1:18 sworn [1] - 139:16 **SWORN** [1] - 6:21 **syllabic** [1] - 20:8 Syndrome [3] - 80:23, 80:25, 81:9 **syndromes** [1] - 71:1 syringomyelia[1] -110:11 **syrinx** [4] - 109:21, 109:22, 109:23, 110:6 system [5] - 37:22, 54:7, 102:4, 115:12, 116:20 T

table [1] - 7:8 tablet [1] - 113:15 tablets [6] - 24:21, 63:20, 113:4, 113:5, 113:6 target [1] - 118:8 task [2] - 130:7, 139:4 Task [2] - 19:3 taste [1] - 25:23 taught [1] - 60:3 teach [1] - 20:11 teacher [1] - 60:2 teachings [1] - 22:7 tease [1] - 67:2 technical [1] - 103:6 telephone [5] - 3:6, 3:13, 100:16, 129:3, 137:17 temporal [2] - 38:19, 41:1 tend [2] - 37:12, 40:21 tendency [1] - 100:7 tendered [1] - 126:22 tenderness [1] -109:13 tends [1] - 115:2 tens [2] - 30:18, 67:6 term [14] - 13:10, 14:15, 16:22, 16:25, 17:2, 18:6, 21:18, 27:25, 28:15, 56:21, 60:19, 84:20, 112:20 terms [22] - 20:10,

22:6, 26:17, 28:7, 38:14, 38:17, 44:14, 46:21, 54:20, 59:6, 62:2, 65:20, 66:17, 67:19, 69:5, 69:9, 72:5, 95:5, 95:22, 99:2, 114:1, 115:6 territories [1] - 50:14 test [4] - 16:14, 54:11, 102:5, 110:16 tested [3] - 101:25, 102:7 testified [27] - 5:9, 26:13, 31:3, 31:7, 31:12, 31:17, 31:20, 31:22, 33:8, 54:19, 60:6, 60:11, 65:9, 66:14, 69:25, 74:12, 75:13, 76:13, 76:15, 77:3, 79:11, 87:15, 110:25, 111:22, 112:14, 116:14 **TESTIFIED** [1] - 6:21 testifies [1] - 128:12 testify [18] - 3:23, 4:2, 4:4, 4:8, 4:13, 5:7, 31:24, 32:7, 32:23, 33:1, 73:4, 76:20, 120:11, 121:20, 127:2, 144:5 testifying [2] - 111:18, 111:22 testimony [27] - 3:10, 3:23, 4:23, 5:8, 5:15, 5:19, 5:24, 6:8, 7:4, 32:12, 73:6, 79:4, 102:21, 127:13, 127:14, 128:6, 128:8, 128:10, 129:5, 129:17, 131:19, 132:9, 132:13, 138:10, 138:23, 140:4, 144:2 testing [4] - 54:6, 57:8, 101:11, 114:7 tests [1] - 94:15 text [2] - 91:16, 91:24 THE [86] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:10, 1:12, 1:16, 3:1, 3:5, 3:21, 6:10, 6:13, 6:17, 6:22, 6:24, 7:1, 7:7, 7:10, 7:17, 8:7, 8:9. 13:10. 13:11. 27:17, 27:19, 27:21, 71:18, 72:8, 72:11, 72:18, 72:20, 73:15, 73:19, 102:17, 103:12, 103:16, 103:20, 114:9, 116:4, 116:5, 116:7,

116:12, 116:25, 118:6, 119:11, 119:13, 119:14, 119:15, 119:18, 119:21, 120:5, 127:16, 127:21, 128:4, 129:2, 129:15, 129:25, 130:3, 130:10, 130:19, 130:22, 130:25, 131:4, 131:8, 132:20, 133:8, 133:12, 133:14, 134:20, 136:11, 136:14, 137:13, 139:1, 140:15, 140:23, 141:2, 141:9, 141:13, 141:18, 143:13, 143:17, 144:11, 144:20, 144:23, 145:1, 145:7, 145:12, 145:17 themselves [2] -136:5, 138:21 therapeutic [2] - 67:9, 97.22 therapeutics [1] - 15:9 therapists [1] - 15:16 therapy [4] - 12:11, 14:20, 22:4, 27:7 thereafter [1] - 68:1 therefore [9] - 13:13, 15:11, 24:6, 41:15, 53:7, 54:3, 55:5. 56:12, 99:2 thereof [1] - 52:25 they've [4] - 50:19, 98:8, 98:10, 138:20 thinking [4] - 17:7, 83:6, 125:3 thinks [1] - 127:4 third [2] - 101:16, 108:12 Third [4] - 4:19, 5:13, 5:14, 139:18 Thomas [39] - 1:9, 3:10, 3:16, 3:23, 3:24, 4:12, 4:17, 4:20, 4:25, 5:4, 5:7, 5:9, 5:19, 5:24, 6:19, 6:25, 7:4, 7:13, 7:16, 7:19, 8:13, 12:15, 15:23, 17:8, 26:13, 52:13, 60:3, 67:25, 71:8, 72:5, 72:17, 73:17, 73:18, 116:9, 116:11, 117:4,

118:12, 119:13,

124:22 **THOMAS**[1] - 6:25 Thomas' [8] - 4:23, 5:1, 5:15, 6:8, 71:16, 114:7, 118:1 thorns [1] - 55:13 thousands [8] - 29:14, 30:14, 30:18, 39:25, 43:3. 67:6 three [11] - 13:25, 14:1, 16:1, 56:11, 69:11, 76:24, 93:24, 109:7, 113:3, 129:24, 129:25 threshold [1] - 132:2 throat [1] - 62:11 throughout [4] -20:19, 29:19, 34:11, 61:24 Thursday [1] - 3:6 **THURSDAY**[1] - 1:10 tight [1] - 73:14 title [2] - 47:16, 48:6 Title [12] - 40:16, 43:14, 43:23, 44:24, 45:12, 47:9, 47:17, 47:22, 71:22, 71:23, 72:1, 146:6 titled [2] - 44:19, 47:10 titration [5] - 25:17, 25:18, 25:21, 25:24, 26:12 today [19] - 7:25, 16:17, 65:10, 78:17, 80:2, 111:22, 120:12, 126:20, 127:7, 130:7, 130:13, 131:15, 132:9, 137:10, 140:5, 140:12, 140:19, 142:24, 143:5 together [4] - 64:9, 64:10, 116:19, 140:17 tolerance [6] - 63:12, 96:25, 97:21, 98:11, 113:20, 113:23 tolerant [2] - 98:8, 112:22 tolerate [1] - 68:19 took [4] - 9:1, 33:11, 37:2, 131:7 tool [1] - 61:3 top [1] - 34:17 topical [1] - 106:21 torsades [1] - 26:25 totally [1] - 71:5 toxic [6] - 24:7, 95:23,

96:22, 97:24, 98:1, 98:4 toxicity [2] - 65:13 toxicologist [5] -83:23, 83:25, 84:3, 84:6. 100:15 **Toxicology** [1] - 99:22 toxicology [15] - 35:5, 61:18, 62:17, 63:1, 63:24, 92:9, 95:6, 95:7, 99:23, 100:9, 100:18, 100:22, 101:8, 101:15 track [1] - 145:14 traditional [2] - 144:3, 144:12 training [19] - 8:16, 8:17, 9:25, 11:2, 11:6, 11:24, 16:15, 22:21, 23:10, 30:23, 38:10, 46:11, 46:22, 65:7, 66:19, 83:15, 84:2, 86:9, 88:6 trainings [1] - 21:2 TRANSCRIPT[1] - 1:9 transcript [5] - 1:21, 35:20, 146:7, 146:10, 146:22 transcription [1] -1:22 translate [1] - 86:19 translated [1] - 52:8 trauma [3] - 10:12, 30:8, 62:2 traveled [3] - 127:11, 129:10, 138:19 trazodone [1] - 108:22 treat [2] - 22:15, 59:14 treated [10] - 27:2, 29:12, 29:23, 30:1, 30:5, 30:10, 63:2, 82:2, 92:25, 135:11 treating [8] - 14:6, 67:7, 75:25, 77:18, 82:2, 82:3, 90:15, 93:17 treatment [50] - 13:6, 13:12, 14:14, 15:4, 15:21, 16:16, 16:25, 17:12, 17:21, 18:3, 18:9, 19:25, 21:11, 22:2, 22:3, 22:16, 22:18, 22:22, 22:25, 23:2, 23:4, 23:5, 25:11, 25:15, 26:11, 27:1, 27:4, 27:7, 27:9, 28:20, 34:5, 38:3, 38:20, 38:23, 45:22, 51:3, 51:17,

53:5, 54:2, 54:25,

55:2, 57:14, 59:19, 82:11, 109:17, 134:5, 134:6, 135:5, 135:11 Treatment [5] - 22:14, 40:23, 41:23, 50:7, 72:1 triad [2] - 46:7, 46:19 trial [10] - 5:8, 5:9, 5:12, 86:17, 102:22, 103:23, 124:21, 124:24, 124:25, 134:19 **trials** [1] - 87:2 tricks [1] - 23:18 tricyclics [1] - 110:16 tried [2] - 77:16, 127:8 trier [1] - 103:7 true [8] - 43:10, 44:8, 54:17, 98:15, 112:19, 138:9, 144:20, 146:7 truth [5] - 126:24, 134:8, 134:22, 136:7, 142:6 truthful [1] - 127:3 try [4] - 13:7, 62:10, 92:1, 119:21 trying [4] - 15:21, 38:23, 44:12, 103:17 tumor [1] - 70:20 turn [14] - 7:21, 40:15, 40:20. 48:21. 104:25, 106:5, 107:4, 107:13, 107:25, 108:18, 109:5, 123:6, 123:8, 132:11 turned [3] - 34:19, 103:23, 129:14 turning [1] - 37:13 twice [1] - 67:11 two [18] - 3:7, 3:25, 9:25, 10:17, 10:18, 31:23, 63:21, 76:16, 77:1, 79:22, 79:25, 80:12, 89:1, 91:5, 103:2, 108:23, 118:10, 126:20 two-year [1] - 10:18 type [3] - 8:15, 24:3, 141:20 types [3] - 20:5, 29:11, 71:1 typical [2] - 59:16, 61:3 typically [1] - 26:7

U **U.S** [2] - 37:22, 73:11 ultimate [1] - 103:24 ultimately [1] - 144:11 um-hum [1] - 68:13 unable [1] - 122:9 unattended [1] - 85:15 unconsciousness [1] - 62:20 under [26] - 20:1, 22:17, 47:22, 49:9, 49:15, 51:10, 61:24, 93:14, 102:25, 103:4, 110:12, 111:23, 117:15, 117:20, 118:12, 120:21, 131:24, 132:17, 133:5, 133:8, 138:10, 141:5, 141:25, 146:11, 146:23 undergoes [1] - 22:20 undergraduate [1] -8:24 underlying [4] - 42:7, 46:23, 70:13, 70:20 understood [4] - 83:5, 92:25, 95:15, 103:19 unexpected [4] - 39:9, 54:8. 54:16. 61:15 unintended [1] - 61:8 unique [3] - 23:8, 28:10, 58:9 **UNITED** [3] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:12 United [26] - 1:13, 3:5, 3:22, 4:22, 5:18, 6:18, 7:3, 8:1, 11:7, 11:8, 47:10, 50:14, 51:19, 66:9, 71:23, 79:12, 121:24, 123:11, 125:8, 125:21, 126:22, 139:7, 139:17, 146:4, 146:6, 146:17 units [1] - 114:1 University [4] - 9:1, 9:5, 9:7, 9:16 unless [5] - 65:4, 119:22, 138:8, 142:22, 146:23 unnecessarily [1] -123:4 unqualified [1] - 32:23 unreadable [1] - 92:6 unrecognizable [1] -39:16 unsure [1] - 116:4

untruthfulness [1] -

139:14 unwilling [1] - 59:18 **up** [21] - 4:2, 8:3, 24:5, 26:17. 26:19. 69:2. 74:5, 80:14, 88:1, 92:3, 100:20, 102:5, 102:8, 110:5, 110:12, 112:6, 118:1, 120:20, 122:10, 122:23, 140:6 up-to-date [1] - 8:3 **update** [1] - 74:16 updated [3] - 8:4, 40:24, 40:25 updates [2] - 41:1, 49:24 urinalysis [1] - 110:18 urination [2] - 108:14 urine [11] - 54:6, 54:11, 54:12, 58:13, 100:12, 102:7, 102:8, 102:15, 110:15, 110:19, 110:24 Urine [1] - 54:8 user [3] - 46:8, 98:2, 98:5 usual [28] - 4:6, 5:10, 5:25, 19:10, 23:6, 32:6, 33:4, 33:16, 33:24, 38:16, 39:2, 39:11, 39:14, 40:8, 42:19, 45:5, 45:16, 45:22, 47:25, 49:3, 52:15, 57:12, 65:4, 65:24, 117:11, 121:16, 136:2, 136:3 utility [1] - 127:6 utilized [1] - 41:4 utilizing [1] - 42:4

V

valid [8] - 45:9, 47:4, 47:18, 47:20, 47:22, 48:18, 49:12, 65:20 validity [2] - 5:24, 65:19 Valium [6] - 63:16, 106:17, 106:22, 107:2, 107:3, 108:22 Valley [1] - 36:6 value [10] - 95:16, 95:17, 97:12, 97:19, 97:22, 97:23, 97:24, 98:1, 99:24 values [3] - 94:22, 98:11, 100:1 variability [1] - 112:10

variable [2] - 113:25, 114.2 varied [1] - 64:13 variety [1] - 93:3 various [8] - 10:24, 20:24, 22:19, 31:4, 38:21, 50:14, 75:7, 97.14 vary [1] - 124:7 vast [1] - 29:14 vector [1] - 98:24 veil [1] - 20:7 veins [1] - 110:5 vena [2] - 94:20, 97:11 ventricles [1] - 110:1 verbatim [1] - 142:19 verification [1] -101:11 victims [1] - 100:6 video [1] - 35:21 view [6] - 33:20, 38:8, 51:11, 56:6, 132:23, 136:23 viewed [1] - 137:17 vigilance [1] - 25:15 vigilant [1] - 55:22 violations [2] - 19:12, 46.1 virtually [3] - 37:11, 39:3, 41:3 visit [3] - 104:16, 108:25, 110:21 visits [2] - 92:22, 104:13 vitae [11] - 7:24, 8:1, 8:3. 8:14. 17:14. 19:1, 20:15, 22:9, 31:25, 74:10, 74:13 vital [2] - 106:15, 135:12 voided [1] - 142:16 volatile [1] - 81:14 **volume** [1] - 36:23 voluminous [1] -24:24 **vs**[1] - 1:5

W

Waived [2] - 22:10, 22:20 waiver [1] - 22:17 walk [2] - 24:23, 53:8 Wall [1] - 123:14 wants [6] - 119:23, 121:10, 126:7, 135:20, 136:11, 136:23 warned [1] - 23:12 warning [1] - 23:11 warnings [1] - 42:1 warrant [13] - 35:19, 72:23, 121:9, 122:6, 122:24, 123:7. 124:6. 125:19. 126:23, 127:23, 141:7, 142:7, 142:16 warranted [2] -131:24, 132:8 warrants [2] - 123:8, 137:14 WASHINGTON[1] -1:24 **Washington** [1] - 1:14 watched [2] - 35:20, 67:14 watching [1] - 53:7 wave [2] - 51:21, 137:22 Wayne [1] - 36:2 ways [2] - 15:7, 132:4 weak [1] - 87:8 weaker [1] - 87:13 weaned [5] - 63:3, 63:12, 113:1, 113:14, 113:21 weaning [1] - 63:21 week [3] - 108:25, 113:7, 113:17 weeks [1] - 109:7 weight [1] - 124:6 well-documented [1] -61:21 Western [2] - 9:1, 123:15 Westlaw [1] - 125:8 wherein [1] - 3:25 whole [3] - 25:22, 129:16. 135:22 wide [2] - 52:2 widely [1] - 124:7 widespread [1] - 65:2 willing [1] - 129:20 wish [4] - 6:13, 127:7, 143:2, 145:2 wishes [2] - 73:7, 136:10 withdrawal [2] -118:15, 118:23

within-mentioned [1]

witness [23] - 6:17,

120:9, 120:24,

122:11, 122:12,

125:1, 125:17,

125:20, 128:21,

129:9, 129:10,

130:1, 130:8,

130:14, 130:23,

7:2, 76:18, 117:19,

- 146:8

135:9, 138:16 WITNESS [5] - 6:24, 13:11, 116:4, 116:7, 119:14 witnesses [39] -72:24, 73:9, 73:13, 119:16, 119:19, 120:8, 120:10, 120:20, 120:24, 121:5, 121:8, 121:10, 121:14, 124:12, 124:19, 125:10, 125:12, 126:7, 126:25, 127:8, 128:14, 128:22, 128:25, 129:22, 130:16, 130:18, 130:23, 133:6, 133:23, 134:3, 134:9, 136:9, 137:25, 138:14, 139:17, 140:12, 141:6, 143:5, 143:8 WL [1] - 123:16 wonderful [3] -121:17, 124:20, 126:11 words [2] - 20:8, 46:3 worker [1] - 21:1 Worker's [4] - 17:12, 75:22, 75:24 workers [2] - 12:14, 59:23 works [1] - 96:8 World [1] - 16:3 worst [2] - 44:10, 60:1 wound [1] - 82:24 Wright [2] - 11:8, 11:13 write [2] - 57:5, 84:12 writing [4] - 43:3, 58:21, 91:22, 121:6 written [12] - 4:1, 4:5, 4:6, 33:14, 33:15, 34:3, 34:8, 40:7, 113:7, 120:25, 131:12 wrote [3] - 91:23, 112:14, 139:2

131:1, 131:5, 135:7,

X

X" [2] - 42:13, 42:14

Υ

YEAGER [4] - 1:23, 146:3, 146:13, 146:16

Yeager [1] - 146:13 **year** [7] - 9:20, 10:18, 10:22, 11:1, 56:11, 76:11, 104:21 years [17] - 9:25, 10:17, 11:6, 11:14, 11:15, 12:17, 14:1, 29:12, 30:11, 30:12, 54:24, 64:8, 67:22, 69:11, 76:6, 82:1, 119:2 yesterday [2] -120:23, 121:19 yokshan [1] - 139:17 young [1] - 127:12 yourself [5] - 7:15, 11:3, 83:12, 90:10, 90:20

Ζ

Z" [1] - 42:16 **zero** [1] - 86:12